

**Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting**  
**Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation (SCI) meeting**  
**Saturday 6 April 2013 at 15:00 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#apr>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

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

Coordinator: At this time the conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect. You may begin when you're ready.

Man: For the transcript, Standing Committee Implementation. It is Saturday, April 06, 2013 2:55 local time Beijing.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so hello everyone it's Jonathan Robinson again. We are going to kick off the next session, which is reporting on the latest progress from the standing committee improvement implementation.

And I would like to welcome Ron Andruff who is the chair of that group.

Ron Andruff: Good afternoon everyone. Thank you chairman.

I thank you for giving us an opportunity to speak this afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here.

And just to put a little framework around what the standing committee and implementation do. We're the body that is responsible that when a policy has been developed through a working group and then put into an implementation mode, if it has some rough edges around it and it's not functioning and smoothly as one would hope it then gets sent to the SCI. And the SCI is made up of virtually all of the members of the community.

So then we wrestle with a - trying to knock the rough edges off it and bring it back to the council, which then will put it into an implementation mode. So that's a general just kind of overview as to how we approach our activities.

It's a very collegial group I have to say. And I'm very pleased to be the chair of that body, because we do find our way through most of the issues in a very collegial and workable manner. And so it shows that the model works.

So one of the things I also wanted to mention was that our approach is really a light touch. So we don't view ourselves as being responsible for developing new policy and new rules and so forth but rather to really look at things as objectively as we can. And if it's something that we feel is something that is an anomaly and maybe will might not happen again we don't - we're not in a hurry to make changes to it but rather to let it sit and watch and wait and come back and review it perhaps six months or 12 months later to see if in fact that issue has resolved itself.

And so a lot of the work that we're doing right now we've taken that approach, and I think it's a very good one. So this is a list of the work that we're doing. It begins with the deferral of motions. We we're asked to consider the current council informal practice whereby a party may request a deferral and to a later date. And our review was such that we felt that it was in chair's discretion in fact to make that determination. And so we will then review that in one year.

The second item was raising an issue. And in our charter the question was who had a right to come to the SCI and ask us to look at something. And the recommendation from us is to maintain the current procedure. And that only the council or a working group chartered by council can raise an issue with us as opposed to others members of the community.

And we felt that way, because within the GNSO council obviously we have representation from across the board in the community. So the community can come to us through their representatives.

Regard to resubmitting a motion, this was an issue that had took up a lot of discussion. And there were a lot of different viewpoints on it. The main point here was -- from some people in the community -- if consensus has been achieved then we should be happy and move forward with it. And then there were others that said well perhaps we should codify some practice, some best practice here. And so in fact we did a lot of work on this topic and it's now we're considering a couple of procedural changes.

We've had I think three or four constituencies have come back with their approval of what we're doing, but it was still out with a couple of others and we have a meeting tomorrow afternoon. And I expect that we'll get closure on that. And once we do we'll move it through the channel as appropriately.

Termination and suspension of a PDP, that's some work that we did finish. And in fact the comment period closes tomorrow. And we'll have a reply period if there's any comments received. But that's a piece of work that was done again in a very collegial manner. We were pretty pleased with how all of the members of the committee worked on that.

Working group guidelines survey was drafted by staff. We looked at it ourselves internally, and then we sent it out and asked for some testing. All of the members of the SCI went through that. And now it's up to the ITRPC. And we've gotten some responses back. And I guess we'll get more information at

our meeting tomorrow with regard to that. But we feel that it's pretty well ready to distribute to the working groups. And the purpose of this survey is really to get feedback back from those working groups to make sure that in fact the tools that they're given when they go off to work in fact work.

And then finally we have the SCI charter revision. The SCI's been around now for a couple of years. And so it's the - was time for us to go back and review the charter because it's - there was a lot of elements that were kind of hold over pieces from when we went through our last major review as a GNSO. And as a result we are now looking at that charter revision. We've assigned a sub team to come up with some ideas. And that sub team -- I think -- has done its work and we'll again take that up tomorrow at our meeting in the afternoon.

That meeting is from 5:00 to 6:30. And all are welcome to attend.

There was - around the issue -- one last comment -- of the resubmission of a motion. The discussion led to some really deep thinking within the group. And particularly for the NCAs. When we have appointees coming from the NomCom, they join the council without any background or information. They're fresh faces, fresh voices, and fresh minds to come to ICANN.

And so we felt it was very important that there's some kind of a perimeter or perhaps better said a new councilor orientation that would be an absolute must. And we understand since then I've also spent some time talking to Rob Hoggarth about this that staff have come forward with a recommendation on that. They've published GNSO 101 and the basics about GNSO processes and procedures at the end of March.

So I'm not sure where that stands with council right now, but we would be very grateful if council would actually give that a good look to make sure that it fulfills that need. Because as ICANN continues to mature and develop, it's really important that councilors in particular councils also those who are

NonCom appointees have some basis of understanding as to what their role is and how the whole thing works. Because it's a very complicated animal -- ICANN -- for people coming in brand new.

And so this orientation element, chair, I would hope that you would look at that closely and give consideration. And if you feel it's necessary for SCI to get involved then we'd be happy to get involved. But at this stage we don't see that, but we do feel that it's important that these - understanding about ICANN some kind of processes in place.

And even looking to our NCAs where other councilors might reach out and sort of partner with them to give them an understanding and give them a place where they can bounce ideas off of and comment and so forth so that doesn't take two years for NonCom appointees to get up to speed and then find that the NonCom is appointed yet other appointees and they're no longer on the council exactly when they have all their tools to work with.

So that summarizes our report for today. And just want to say again how grateful we are to have this opportunity to present that to you. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Ron, much appreciated. And the value of this your work in the SCI certainly is easy to recognize given that this is an opportunity for ongoing improvement. I see Chuck you've come up. I just want to make a brief comment on induction, councilor education and so on.

It was something that I immediately recognized on joining the council in the last - at the Toronto meeting. We did deal with it to some extent although I fully take on board that we could do better and more. What we did already was held an introductory session. And the work that you referred to of what Hoggarth the (unintelligible) of all the preparatory materials has continued to develop.

There's a whole lot of education materials available, but it's sort of systematic induction of councilors and work is something we could do more on. What we have done out of our Amsterdam meeting in January -- which was a council leadership staff meeting -- was we recognized that as an issue and we in fact talked with Rob subsequently.

We've also -- as I've mentioned this morning -- while attempting to arrange on the back of when the new councilors join in the fall meeting for the - I'm not sure what we call that meeting, the third meeting of the year since it's not fall or autumn everywhere depending on what hemisphere you're in.

But nevertheless that meeting at which the new councilors join the council we are proposing to extend our time at the meeting physically by a day in order to orient new councilors and gather the council together and prepare for the year's work ahead.

So it's certainly on my radar screen, something I recognize and something which we can and even could do more on. So thanks for reminding us on that. As I find (unintelligible) Ron I'm not sure it is the (unintelligible) from my perspective it's something very firmly that we as the council should take on led by myself.

Ron Andruff: Agreed. And I'm happy to hear this comment Jonathan, because I think that that's also - these kind of activities will also build a stronger council in the terms of the cooperatory (sic) -- if there's such a word -- group where people are really working together to develop the kinds of things that we need in ICANN from a policy perspective. So thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Ron. Chuck

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Ron are you familiar with the ICANN Academy work that's going on?

Ron Andruff: Actually I'm not familiar with it, Chuck, but I have been - it's been brought to my attention.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That's mainly what I wanted to do. You might want to have someone from that group do a briefing for the SCI, because there's no use duplicating a lot of things. And it may be that some of the need to regard with orientation and so forth it was initiated by the ALAC, but as long since been brought into the whole community. So and they're looking at online training and in person training -- a lot of things.

But based on what you said and even what Jonathan said with regard to what the council's considering for or preparing, there's probably some good overlap there that could be taken advantage of.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Chuck. Thanks for bringing that to my attention. Excellent. Avri (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria, also a member of the SCI and coincidentally a member of the academy group. And so I'm more than willing to talk to the SCI about it.

But I have to say that I kind of agreed that it's not within our scope unless the GNSO was to put it in our scope, which I'm not sure I'd recommend. But at the moment, you know, I'm not sure. And with Jonathan sort of saying that it was something that you were well aware of I don't know that there's an SCI issue there.

But being a member of both I'm certainly able to fill in if need be.

Ron Andruff: Very good. And I don't want to make any misrepresentations. I wasn't offering for SCI to pick that up. I was only saying that if we're asked we'd be happy to do so. Thank you. And with regard to the academy let's make sure that we bring that up on the meeting tomorrow. Thank you Avri.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Any other comments or questions for Ron on the work on the SCI -- or for that matter, for Avri? Well done. Thanks very much Ron.

Thank you all. All right we're scheduled to have a break at this stage. So I suggest we break. And we were scheduled for a 15 minute break. I suggest we reconvene at half past the hour which will bring us 15 minutes ahead of the time.

Is that too long? Any comments on that? Is 22 minutes too long?

All right. Let's reconvene at half past the hour then. And please if you could be prompt given that it's our longest break so that councilors can be reseated by 15:30 local time. Thanks very much.

END