

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI) meeting
Thursday 15th 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 (SCI) meeting Teleconference on Thursday 15 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-20121115-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen – ISPCP – Primary
Angie Graves – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC Alternate
Ronald Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency - Primary
Mary Wong - NCUC

Apologies :

Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary
J. Scott Evans – IPC Primary
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group - Alternate
Julie Hedlund

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings
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.

Julie Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on Thursday 15 of November.

On the call today we have Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Angie Graves, Anne Aikman-Scalese. We have apologies from Avri Doria, Julie Hedlund, J. Scott Evans and James Bladel. And from staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Julia Charvolen.

I would like 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 very much, Julia. So is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking? So we have on the agenda today at first statement of interest. Is there anything to disclose from the participants? I see none.

Then we have on the agenda the following topics: We have the chair and vice chair election where we would like to talk about the procedure of the election first; and then we have the deferral of motion several times discussed and views exchanged on the list.

And another point is update on public comments on the changes to the PDP manual, suspension of a PDP, just an update. And another point where we should come to a decision is raising an issue where we have put some options to the table. And we have also some opinions on that. And last not least the status update on working group survey and how can we go forward with the working group survey.

So I see Mary Wong on Adobe as well. And, hi, Mary, are you on the line?

Mary Wong: Yes, hi, Wolf. Hi, everybody.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Great, Mary. Well it's - I'm happy, well, to have you here. And now we have a big gender imbalance I would say here in this...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Also we have lack of participation so as the only male one and the others - I'm happy, well, that I'm surrounded by so many female colleagues. Thank you very much.

So but I think so we have - we are least four so we can talk about these things. And if you have some ideas which you put together then then let's do it for the next time and send it out and to the list so that the others can be informed about.

With regards to - and let's - if there is no objection I would like to step into the first of our items; the procedural things, questions, with regards to chair and vice chair election. So you remember we had - okay we pointed out, Avri and myself, in Toronto that it should - it's now time, well, to think about and to reelect or to elect chair and vice chair of this standing committee.

And I put a suggestion on the list, well, okay. We - one is about talking about the procedure and then nominating - nominate a candidate from the membership of the SCI and then the question is how we can go to elect a candidate for that.

The last time it was done this way that we - people have been nominated or self-nominate themselves; that is also an option. And then if - we have two positions, chair and vice chair, and if there is more than one nominee per position then we should hold, at least, a balloting. Anyway we have to talk about any candidate afterwards and find a conclusion on that.

So that would be a very brief and uncomplicated procedure. And I wonder whether this is - there are other ideas from your side how we could put

forward this. And then my question would be to you as well did you have, from your position, from your stakeholder group, any thoughts about that already? Are there ideas? Are there names? Well just open the floor. Mary, please.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Wolf. And, you know, we're NCUC and NCSG and I think (NC) too were fine with the procedure that you put forward. And I spoke with Avri this morning and if it's time to nominate anybody I'd like to nominate her as the incoming chair since, you know, you actually wanted to step down.

And so if you're not continuing, Wolf, I think Avri would be a good candidate because of her long experience in the GNSO.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Good afternoon, all. This is Ron Andruff speaking. I beg your pardon. I've arrived late into my hotel and I've just logged on. And I just wanted to check in and just let you know that I'm on the line and I apologize for being late. I understand you're talking about the chair position.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi, Ron. Nice to hear you. And sure, well, I hope that you can hear us very well. We just started so we are four persons; we are - at the time four persons from the SCI is Anne, it's Angie, it's Mary, it's myself and I'm happy that another male joined us...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So and we have Julia and Marika from staff as well. So we just started about the procedural questions of chair and vice chair election. And I was asking to the colleagues whether they have already had the discussion within their respective groups and whether there are name or there is a procedural questions or whatever.

So - and right now I see Anne, raise your hand, please, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, yes, thank you. Wolf-Ulrich. This is Anne Aikman-Scalese from the IPC. When Mary mentioned if you are not continuing that raised the question in my mind because I kind of feel as though, you know, we've more or less just gotten started and maybe it's just that a year has gone by very quickly. But have you, Wolf-Ulrich, indicated intention not to stand for chair?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well, you know, it's almost two years...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Is it really? Oh.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So when we started - so it started a little bit - not in that sense that we had regular meetings from the beginning but it started relatively early. And so I would say it's an interesting job really, well, and I do it - I like to do it and I liked to do it. But openly speaking, you know, I think, you know, I'm, here, a fan of the ICANN model in these things, the working group model but they have changes - we will have changes.

We have changes on Council, regular changes so we should have also - since this standing committee is standing committee it's not a working group, you know.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So there should be changes I think.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: And who's the current vice chair, if I may? I don't even know the answer to that, I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Avri - it's Avri.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh it's Avri, oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you for clarifying.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay so, Anne, did you have - had any discussion within the IPC or...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No there's actually not been any discussion at this point. What exactly is our timing? I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: No, there is no timing. So the charter is very easy, you know, I mean, up to a point. So it's - there is no timing that - so it's up to us, well.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh okay. Well I think this is something, you know, from IPC standpoint that we need to bring to the attention of our membership that there's a change afoot in relation to chair and to get some input from them. Because, you know, neither J. Scott nor I have, you know, had an opportunity to put that in front of IPC.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes okay, great. Thank you. Ron is next, yeah, please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. In fact I've had a conversation internally within the BC with the chair of the BC and a couple of others. And I would, through their encouragement, be happy to throw my hat into the ring as well for taking the chair role of the SCI for the next period. So I just wanted to make mention of that on this call. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. Thank you very much, Ron. So we have at least two candidates for the chair position. Well it's good as many candidates we have. So I think is there any other comment on that first from a NG SO? No I don't hear anything.

So we - also we have - we didn't have, let me say, as an ISPCP member a big discussion on that because we have, okay, myself here and Tony is my alternate. He was also asking me why I shouldn't continue. Well I told him the same thing so he agrees to that. So it's just a question so (unintelligible).

So what we should do right now is - or is, Anne, did you - do you still raise your fingers?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh I'm sorry. I did want to ask a question, though, which is who's not represented on the call? Is it...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Who is not on the call?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, not for profits - which stakeholders or constituencies have no representative on the call? That's my...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well it's the registrars and the registries are not on the call.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: And from the constituencies I would say it - well it is, no, it's IPC, ISPCP, BC. We have all from the - and we have Mary representing the NCSG and the NCUC so we do not have one from the NPOC.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right, okay.

Marika Konings: And the Nominating Committee appointees are...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh yeah, sure, sure because, well, it's not - that was just decided just to keep you informed that Jennifer Wolfe shall join as the primary member and Thomas Rickert her alternate will be here to the SCI.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Now is it possible to - when we send out, for example, the minutes - this is Anne speaking again, I'm sorry, from IPC. Would it be possible for us to send out in the minutes that Avri is nominated by Mary and that Ron is self-nominated and ask any others who are interested to express an interest or nomination and then to address it again in the next call?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, that's very good, Anne. So that's the - what I would like to suggest, well, let's do that way I think. If you do not have further questions regarding the procedure itself then I would say that's it for the moment that we have; we have two candidates so we put it on the list and we ask the others, well, their opinion, yeah?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to clarify if you'll be looking for a chair and vice chair again for the upcoming term, so we can clarify that as well in the minutes that go out that it's not just the chair position but you're looking for the two posts right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes that's correct, Marika, yes. The question as you mentioned, well, the - for the next term as the term is not fixed by the charter. So it doesn't matter, yeah, okay. Let's call it the next term, yes. Okay so that's clear so for chair and vice chair.

Do we have names for the vice chair position? I see Ron. Ron, please. Ron, can you hear me?

Ron Andruff: Beg your pardon; I just had to get off mute. Thank you, Chair. Just regarding the term we had kind of set a precedent now with you and Avri as the vice chair doing a two-year stint. And I wonder if we might consider just trying to set some kind of a policy going forward. Obviously we'll need a much larger - many more members or all the members to determine this.

But perhaps we could be looking at a one-year term with a one-year renewal and then rotate out. Because as you said sometimes we're not doing very much work so in the course of a year we may be doing very little.

Alternatively we may doing a lot. But with one-year term and a second year - a second year as a full term, in other words, after two years that the chair would step down.

I think that that makes a lot of sense. And what you've said is quite right is that you've enjoyed it but in the spirit of a bottom-up consensus-building organization it's a good idea to rotate this. And I think two years is plenty; one year may be not quite enough in terms of providing continuity. So I like the idea and I just wanted to go on record to suggest that might be a good way forward. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Can we put that to the notes as well? So that means that is an option, well, to say okay a term as we see it or a suggestion for a term which means two-year term since - as Ron explained or one year maybe too short in that respect. And - but a two-year - it should be limited to a two-year. Just put it as a suggestion to the notes and we can ask next time also when we have this discussion, well, to (around) that is fine, their needs as well. And then we have this option.

Okay, Ron, again.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Chair. I just wanted to comment on the fact - on the notes that Marika is putting in I just - just a quick point of clarification for Marika. The note says, "Consider a term, for example, two-year term." What I was suggesting was a one-year term with a one-year extension and not more than two years so a one-year term and then (unintelligible).

And if that chair would like to stay for another second year he can but then at the end of two years irrespective of whether he wants to or not - he or she - they should step down. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Thanks - thanks, Marika.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is that - and also, Marika, please put to the note that Ron's name as well.

Marika Konings: He's already there. You mean the self-nomination? That's already in the notes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you. Oh yeah, sure, I have to go down here. Oh yeah, thanks. Good so next point. Deferral of motions. We have had, at the end, the - a text of J. Scott suggestion with a small amendment. So, yes. And I was - we were putting that to the list as well asking if there is any objection.

I got some responses. All of the responses I got - there was Avri today and there were others as well - that were in favor of that text. And is there - I would like to ask here to the (round) is there any more question about that, of understanding or how we shall proceed with that? Please raise your hand. Mary please.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Wolf. This is just to say I didn't respond on the list because I actually had no objection so just to clarify I have not objection and I support the language as it is now.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much. I think following that if I can summarize so is - that we have found a conclusion on that? We can conclude that this text is the one which we are going to suggest and to send to the Council. I just wonder how we are now going in a procedural way with that text.

This text is an explanation which says we are not - we are not proposing any amendment or any modification of the existing Council rules and procedures rather than we would like to clarify that there is - that - what is our opinion on that so that we are thinking, okay, that it's up to the chair that he can use or exercise his or her discretion in - anyway - that means in the affirmative or in the negative way in this respect.

So I wonder - I'm just thinking about how I, as I'm going to report to the Council, shall do this? Shall I put it just in a brief report that I - shall I send it in writing to the Council? And then put the question, okay, for the next Council meeting on the agenda? Is there any need that we have to get approval from the Council to that? Or, you know, I don't think so. Sorry, I'm a little bit confused in that.

We don't need any approval. But, you know, we just give it back to the Council. And say, okay, this is our opinion. And the Council - it's now up to the Council how to deal with that. So that's my opinion on that.

But, Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. I am inclined to agree with what you just said that our job was really to look at this because there was a hole in that part of the policy. We've now given consideration; we hand it back to the GNSO with this recommendation to go forward. And I would expect that they would be able to approve this just as a normal course of their activities.

I don't think there's any discussion that needs to go on further on our side.
And it certainly doesn't have to go back for public comment. So this is really a question of just handing it back to the Council with the explanation that it was this open issue and now we've addressed it and this is our recommendation.
Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Anne please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, this is Anne, Wolf-Ulrich. And thank you. I have a question regarding our own procedures, which is before we do send something like this back to the Council do we actually record any sort of formal vote on it or say who was present or not present? I mean, there is this - there appears to be this general consensus developing. But in terms of our own recordkeeping in order to avoid confusion do we actually have a voting process?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: As to my knowledge - no, usually we do not have a voting on these things. So what we try to get is consensus, yeah.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: And so we have an expression of consensus from the registrar group and the registry group with respect to this item? I may not be completely up on all the emails. Have we had an expression from the groups not present on the phone?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, we - I didn't hear that but I did not hear any objection. So, you know, it was explicitly raised to the list that this is going to be, let me say, not voted on but - at the last call that we had for that.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...so there was nothing on that. But I'm open, well, to hear. Let's just hear Mary please.

Mary Wong: Okay. Thanks, Wolf. And I was going to say something similar. And also that I think, you know, we've had this topic discussed several times, several rounds, several meetings. And I think in Toronto it was agreed at the meeting that the language would be circulated and that was the email that's now up on the screen.

And I think we agreed then that anyone with objections should state their objection on the list. So since we don't have a formal voting procedure I would think that at least in this instance we've fulfilled all the necessary consulting criteria that we could.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, Anne, yeah.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay thank you. So I'm going to write something together and take this text and forward it to the Council with a copy to the SCI as well. And then if the Council has something to ask or is going to deal with that for the next time, well, (unintelligible) I can stand for that. Yes, thank you very much.

So that's - that was this point. Then we have - the next item is update on public comments on changes to the PDP manual. Julia was writing something, which means, to my knowledge, that, yes, please I see, Marika can help me please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to confirm what Julie wrote we opened the public comment forum relatively quickly after Toronto and that's now open. The formal comment period has finished. I think we received one comment from

the Registry Stakeholder Group expressing their support for the proposed change.

And now we're basically in the reply period phase so we'll just let that run out. And if there are no further substantive questions I guess it can move forward then to the GNSO Council for its approval.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much. Even - that leads me to a question, Marika, with regards to the, well, the formal procedure. I understand the public comment procedure in that way. If there was not any comment that would mean that we could immediately execute that, let me say, yeah?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I mean, I had a bit of a discussion actually with Julie over it because I think if you look at the rules it basically says that if there are any substantive comments then you need to have a reply period.

I guess you can argue here as well, you know, the Registry comment is saying we support the recommendation. It doesn't suggest any changes or it doesn't, you know, object to it. So from that perspective you could argue, you know, there's no substantive comment so we should close it.

But at the same time we looked at the period that it will be running for and I think it - quickly trying to pull it up - I think it's - with the reply period it will remain open until the 3rd of December so that will still be sufficient time, you know, provided that there are no further substantive comments to get it to the GNSO Council for consideration at its next meeting.

So from that perspective we felt that there was no harm in actually letting it run its course and then still have sufficient time to submit it to the GNSO Council for its next meeting which I believe is - I think - is it the 20th of December? That would still give time...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Around that time.

Marika Konings: ...yeah, so that would still give time - sufficient time for the SCI to look at the comments that were submitted and, you know, presuming that there were no changes of view then to go ahead and submit that together with a motion to the GNSO Council...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...for their meeting in December.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. Okay I also think, well, in this case we do not have any pressure, you know, so we can really take the full period of the public - for the public comments. So that is another problem.

I was just wondering in general so if sometimes we have - we are under pressure, yeah, so in this. And then it looks a little bit funny so if just one comment is coming in and it's just in support saying okay, yes, I am in support of that, that then it opens a new period, let me say, of time for waiting before action can be taken.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. I think that's indeed - it's a bit of interpretation because I think the rules say if there are, you know, substantive comments and I think in certain cases we've seen if there were only comments saying hey this is great and, you know, no opposition or no suggested changes I think we have closed it at that stage. But as said I think here there is, you know, there's no - we won't miss another Council meeting by just leaving it open so we said let's just let it run and see what happens.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay I understand. Ron please.

Ron Andruff: Yes, thank you, Chair. I just - I just wanted to comment on Marika's statement about substantive comment. This is a comment that is positive and supports the work of the SCI so I don't view that as being substantive. Substantive in my world would be that somebody is, you know, pushing back on it and there's substantial pushback or we need to reconsider.

So I think this is done and dusted for all of what we've done. And I think we shouldn't waste any time getting it to Council for the next possible meeting. If there were, you know, a handful of comments and half were positive and half were negative, you know, just to use a term, then we would obviously have to do something. But at this stage this has been well discussed within the SCI. I think it's time to move it along for my part. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Anne please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Anne. I'm sorry I would have to disagree with respect to not leaving the comment period open because I don't think it's really proper governance procedure for us to decide, well, this is or isn't substantive.

I don't - it makes me uncomfortable that one would say well we're in a position, you know, maybe we all think, well, we know what this comment means and we've concluded it's not substantive. But I just think as a regular procedure that's a very bad idea because someone else, you know, particularly in the public - in the public eye could see that differently and say, you know, why is this being determined on an ad hoc basis as opposed to putting - and so I actually applaud staff for, you know, treating it as they did.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you, Anne. And, Ron, again to that please.

Ron Andruff: Yes, just, Anne, I agree with your comment. We do; we really want to make sure that we're doing everything in the appropriate manner, that we're not cutting corners. No question about that. But what I'm getting at is that if

someone responds positively to what we've done and we're in the response period what's our response? If it was - so that's where the substantive measure - that's how I measure substantive comment.

If the comment is such that we get a positive response to what we've said how do we respond to that except to say thank you? We can't - there's no counter-argument to whatever that filed comment was. And that's where I'm getting at. So I'm just trying to use a yardstick here that kind of makes sense. We put it out there. There was one comment. It was a positive comment and now we're moving on.

But believe me, for my part, I'm just as happy to let this go through the cycle. I'm just suggesting that let's not drag it out any longer than we need to. I think there's been a lot of discussion about it and we've gotten positive feedback on it. So that was where I was coming from. Just a point of clarification. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. Okay thank you. So sometimes we have to follow these formal rules, I would say, also, though. And for example in case - if it comes to the Council - I would suggest and expect it's put on the consent agenda - such kind of thing so that it's not a real big deal, well, for the Council to do so.

In this case we have also - we have enough time so there is nothing under pressure. So let's - I would say let's do it as staff just suggested and then it goes that way. Okay? Thank you very much.

Now we have - the next point which is still open and was put to the list raising an issue. The question about who can do that and how is that done. So we had three options and there was a - it was seen that the Option Number 1, meaning keeping the status quo and not doing any amendments to what is written in the charter, is the one which would have kind of consensus here.

I definitely got that from Avri today as well as from J. Scott on the list. I'm - well still would open that for opinions for other comments to the participants here. Is there any - anything to say? Ron please.

Ron Andruff: Just a note, Chair, that I agreed. Also I supported...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: ...Option 1. And I believe Angie did - Angie Graves as well. So I think we really are pretty well on a consensus on this one. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay so it seems to be the same. So now for me the question because I also would like to report that to the Council, Marika, did we have - I think we had a small text also for - in this context didn't we? So we outlined the three options and then saying okay then this is the Option Number 1, which we are - which we found consensus on? Do we have that - that text available or not? You know?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We need to look it up because I think it was in an email that I sent with the three options. But in this case I'm not really sure whether it necessarily needs to go the Council because I think it was actually more of an internal SCI discussion because I don't think this was a formal request from the Council or anything.

I think it was more triggered by an email we got from an individual and we started then I think debating internally what, you know, we were supposed to do with that; whether we should accept requests from individuals or not or whether - and looked at the charter.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, okay. Well what I mean is not - I wouldn't like to forward it - I'm asking the question - the Council for approval on that or any opinion on that rather than to report, you know. It's going into a report. So that means, for example, what I intend to do if it comes to a new chair and so I would like,

well, to hand over and just with a final report on what we have done so - and I would put it into that report. Is that okay?

Marika Konings: Sure, I don't have any problem with that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: ...from, okay. Thank you very much. Now, Marika, finally do we have time - well about a quarter of an hour for working group survey. Do you have that - the - on the screen here? Yes.

Marika Konings: Yeah, what's up on the screen is - I think the latest version. Because I think following the last call Julie made a couple of changes, I think, based on your discussion so that's what's up on the screen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, well, that was, you know, we discussed the - how to say the scaling - the scaling, so, from 1-7; it was 1-9. And now I see, yes, they have a scale of 1-4. That might be easier to handle. And I think that was in most - the one which was - now was commented and was amended. And, okay, if there are other ideas please raise your hand. I see Anne, please. Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry, I was - I didn't take down my agree from previous...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh yes, you're agreeing, okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I apologize.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, no problem. So if I recall that correctly we also discussed how we - now to deal with that survey. And so to find, let me say, a kind of first group, which we would like to ask to go through as a kind of test or so. Is that the way to do or shall we use this immediately to approach different working

groups which have been working - or which have already finished since the implementation of the new working group model?

There was one group we would like to ask which was chaired by Mikey O'Connor wasn't it? Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, I think I suggested the IRTP Part C working group that was...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh...

Marika Konings: ...chaired by James. James Bladel.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Yes, and I think also James was very open to that. Ron please, yeah.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. I was, unfortunately, not able to attend the Toronto meeting and so I didn't get a chance to find out whether or not - or to hear enough information on this topic. And the question I have is why would we just - if we're going to test it why would we just test it with one working group? Why wouldn't we do two or three and just to get a sense?

I mean, if we're going to do a test it's not really - one working group won't give us that much information. But if we did a handful of them that would. I do agree with the idea of a test before we start putting it into application going forward. But I would suggest that we might want to have a broader base for the test. And if there was discussion on that I apologize for not having been privy to it. But that's just my comment. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you, Ron. Well I'm - yeah, we are open to that, I would say. But, you know, the first thing was we put it here on our list, well, to ask people - members, well, for their ideas with regards to the content, the

completeness, well, anything which you have - which might have in mind with regards to that survey. So that is the outcome right now so far.

So the further question is maybe a working group which has already worked on that and they have some experience they may have in addition some points, well, to raise, which are not - but this is the Number 13, I see. Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to share with the SCI? And so that is the last question.

Is that understandable in that sense meaning, okay, it could be a comment regarding their work and the working group guidelines as also comment with regards to the survey itself. Maybe we can point that out. And then it comes to the question, okay, which of the working groups we are going to use to send out that. Ron please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair. I think the Number 13 question does need to be tightened up. We need to be more specific. If we don't - if we're not clear with the questions we can have such a broad range of answers that really doesn't serve the - serve our efforts or our purpose.

So if we were to suggest that do you have any comments or suggestions regarding the working group process or something like that but really be very specific about what we're looking for in terms of those comments and suggestions.

And then the second point I wanted to bring up was perhaps we could ask staff either - in order to be kind of egalitarian about this rather than picking and choosing which, you know, completed working groups we would select perhaps we could just pick up the last, I don't know, call it five or three - but five would be probably more data for us to be able to get better information - the last five working groups that have been in process we would just go ahead and just take those and ask those people if they wouldn't mind giving us this survey.

Because I think that would then enable us to have a broad range of thoughts coming in. We can then analyze the data that comes out of this thing. And in fact if we have to modify this survey going forward. And then we would be able to implement that with every working group going forward ask this question - these questions and provide this - push this survey to them so they can give us back the data. I think that would be very helpful. So those are the two points I'd like to add to that. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, Ron. Yeah, I got also the feeling, so, that Number 13 should be a little bit more specific right now when I'm reading that. So asking for comments with respect to the survey itself and with respect to the working group guidelines - the working group guidelines.

So that is - if there is something they would like to share with us or that - I think - two points I would say should be specified under 13. And then your suggestion, well, to take at least five, well, working groups I wonder whether we do have so many which already finished their work.

Because that was the idea I think at first we should ask working groups which have already finished their work under the new rules. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And I think, you know, on the comment on how many working groups or which ones I think the challenging part there is a little bit that if you look, you know, we used the working group guidelines very formal for the - when we conduct, you know, formal working groups like PDPs.

But basically there as well at the start of them we, you know, tell them about all the requirements, we tell them to read it, you know, to make use of it. A lot of elements as well come back there in, you know, how the decisions are being made.

But I think, you know, we use the working group guidelines or as a reference document as well in some of the other efforts we have which are not necessarily PDP working groups.

So I'm worried that if we, you know, just do with the last five working groups you might get responses back from those groups that were informal working groups that will say oh but, you know, what are the working group guidelines? I mean, we never really used them.

Because in a lot of these efforts it's more that they, you know, need to come up with a specific response to a certain question or review certain materials or, you know, it's not a formal working group as we understand under, you know, the PDP for example.

So I don't know, for that purpose, if it makes more sense to focus on PDP working groups. And there, there might be a lesser sample at least, you know, completed ones.

I think there, you know, the IRTP one is the one that has completed. I think the UDRP domain name lock working group started, as well, under the new working group guidelines. But I think some of them ones that predate that actually were already working when the new guidelines were adopted.

So maybe, you know, those two otherwise might be appropriate way just to note that one of them actually is still working so they haven't concluded their work yet.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Do we have a list of all these? There must be a list, I'm sure, well, of all the working groups, let me say, since the implementation of the guidelines?

Marika Konings: I mean, the project list is a guide. And otherwise on the - if you look on the GNSO Website there we have all the projects. It would take a little bit of time to matching the dates and seeing which ones actually started after the GNSO

working group guidelines were adopted. But as I said I think from the PDP perspective I think it's only the Locking of a Domain Name Working Group and the IRTP Part C one that formally commenced when we had the new working group guidelines in place.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well I understand - so do you - that you were in favor of more or less PDP-related working groups? Did I understand that correctly? So...

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika again. Because I said I think there we have this, you know, when we start those processes off we normally maybe start with the first session only focused on, you know, what are you, you know, the obligations, where can you find information, what is outlined in the working group guidelines.

And I think with some of the other initiatives that are not formal PDPs that happens less because usually as well they're less rigid; it's normally, you know, a drafting team, a discussion group. So I can check because I know there are some other groups where we did have charters that refer to the working group guidelines but I don't know if they also did this kind of introductory part.

But, you know, I can check that with some of my colleagues if there are other groups that, you know, might be suitable to do a trial with.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Well would it be possible, Marika, for you, well, to put - I understand we have project list as well, yes, and this one. Maybe we take this one or just the - an excerpt of this list regarding to those working groups which would fall under what you have said right now and put it to the list.

And then let's talk about, you know, which one should be picked up; maybe all of them, you know, if - or just, well, that we can all see, you know, in front of us what we have, yeah? And we discuss it on the list, pick some out and

then I understand that we are in agreement that this - the survey after a small revision with regard to the last question shall be sent out.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. We can do that, no problem. Do you already want us to go ahead as well and put the survey into - like a kind of Zoomerang or Survey Monkey tool so we can then, as well, see how it will look when people actually need to fill it in?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Ron is in agreement of that. Are there any other opinion on that? I felt, from the last discussion we had already, that was also how we would go forward with that. Yes.

Okay, Marika, could you provide for that and then we can take the next step then.

Marika Konings: Yes, I'll work with Julie on that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much. Okay great. We have - well I have to say, well, I have a hard stop at - in five minutes here. So - and everybody would be happy if you can finish that time. Is there anything with regards to AOB? Any other business?

We have - we started discussion when - at the beginning with regards to the meeting schedule and meeting time. So there was an idea, well, to send out a poll for the next meeting whether it's feasible - which time is feasible to us. We used to have it in one hour, one hour later, and due to the change of summer time so I got wrong so I put it again here.

So the question we would like to send out a poll - a Doodle poll with one - with at least one option. That means the former time we had. And I would like to ask are there any other options - any other requirements from your side which we should put to the Doodle as well? Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note that in two week's time if that will be again, you know, the schedule we're heading for that it actually will be difficult at least at this time to provide staff support because we're all the way in - for a staff retreat. So I think we are able to provide you with the bridge and set up the conference, etcetera. But I don't think staff will be able to be on the call itself.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. But anyway the Doodle could be sent out, yeah? And, Ron please. Ron, you're on mute.

Ron Andruff: Sorry, exactly on mute. I think that - I'm really happy to hear that you're discussing the - getting the Doodle up again because I think that's important. Everyone has busy schedules and it's really critical that we get as many people on these calls as possible.

And if staff support's not possible in two weeks then we need to move our meeting - or our call - to accommodate that because I think staff support is very, very important to our calls. And this is a good thing; the Doodle and making sure that we have staff on board for that. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Do we have different days, you know, to ask for or shall we stay with the Thursday?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Well this is Anne. Thursday is a good day for me actually.

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Better day, yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ron.

Ron Andruff: Yes, I'm happy with Thursdays as well. As it happens - this time and this day work well for me. But, again...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...the Doodle is going to help make sure it works for everybody else. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: And Mary?

Mary Wong: I'm just thinking how far into the future are we looking at this for?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well up to the next chair election.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: I thought you might say that, Wolf. The reason I raise it is if it goes beyond, you know, January or something I won't be able to do Thursday at this time because of my class schedules for my spring semester. But I can put that on the Doodle. I was just curious.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah, yeah, okay. So let's ask for just - for the near future here. Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So shall we then set up the Doodle poll for the first week of December? And we then select some times on the Thursday?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay great, thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah? Okay, there is support. Okay guys, thank you very much. It was, at the end, very, very fruitful meeting. Thank you very much and have a nice time.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Chair.

((Crosstalk))

END