

**ICANN Singapore Meeting
SCI F2F
TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 18 June 2011 at 09:00 local**

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.

Coordinator: ...being recorded. If you do have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may now begin.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Good morning again. May I ask you all to take a seat. I understand, you know, it's our first meeting in Singapore this morning. Everybody is welcoming every other so we have seen more than three months not each other so I understand very much.

But please take a seat and we can start.

At least I am waiting for my (wife's) chair and then we could start immediately.

So good morning again. This is the meeting of the Standing Committee of the Improvement Implementation in Singapore. And my name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoen. I am the elected Chair of the Standing Committee. And I would like to start the meeting and ask Glen, could you do a roll call for the members who is available and may be available also on the phone?

Woman: I'll get the (unintelligible) now. Have you got the (unintelligible)? Philip Sheppard? He's not here yet. Ron Andruff?

Ron Andruff: Present.

Woman: Are the (alternate) do you know if Philip will be here?

Ron Andruff: I understood Philip would be here but I haven't seen him.

Woman: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich Knobon?

Wolf-Ulrich Knobon: Yes.

Woman: Tony Holmes? I don't think he's arrived yet. Carlos Aguirre? Avri Doria?

Man: Yes, she's here.

Avri Doria: Here.

Woman: Mary Wong? Mary hasn't come yet. Alain Berranger? Ray Fassett?

Man: On the phone.

Woman: Ray's on the line. Ray, can you hear us?

Ray Fassett: Yes, very well, thank you.

Woman: Ray, can you hear us?

Ray Fassett: Yes, I can hear.

Woman: Good. Beau Brendler? Jonathan Robinson? Jonathan? Okay? Krista Papac?

Krista Papac: Here.

Woman: And James Bladel?

James Bladel: Present.

Woman: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And I think we have from the IPC, we have also people on the (unintelligible) -- the daily (unintelligible).

Woman: We have Anna -- Anna (Ikeman) from the IPC. And who else is there. No members. Okay. Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Glen. Thank you, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: So (Mia) asks me to record the call. Is it recording the (tip) yet? Yes, thank you very much.

I have sent out a small agenda for today, and I would like to ask people if they're okay with that agenda this morning, or do we have any additions. No thank you.

So let's start on the last meeting, which took place two weeks ago. So we had, at first, the Chair and Vice Chair election in between. And I'm very happy and I'm very thankful to all of you who -- two to the one -- who stand for the Vice Chair and Chair election at first. And then thank you very much for electing me as your Chair. And I would like to do my very best.

Thank you as well that you elected Avri. And as we will cooperate in the best way. Thank you.

We have since that time had a - the membership of all constituencies and stakeholder groups in our group. And we were discussing last time the liaison question, which was not finished up today. We want to question whether we should or who should do and whether we should establish a liaison to the council, as it is recommended in the working group guidelines.

So I think this question was discussed in that way -- okay, why shouldn't the Chair be that liaison? There were arguments that it might be also good if the Chair is not the one because in my persons - I am a personal - I am a counselor, so (they argued) that there should be another person there to be relation to that.

Thank you. So this question is still open. So I wonder whether there is some comment from people here, from the group, to talk about this question or whether we should see at first what could be our working program and then see is it - is that really a big question or to think about a different person there to be - to act as the liaison to the council?

So I personally would say, so as a Chairman - as a Chair, I would be prepared well to do so because I see that (unintelligible) to be more or less well to report to the council and to report back any ideas coming or comments from the council, rather than out to provide any, let me say, specific comments to what has been done in this talk.

But I am still open, as well, if there are different opinions to that. And I see Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Hi. Thank you, this is Avri. I hesitate to make the first thing I say a contradiction to the Chair of a group I was elected Vice Chair to. I have made this point before.

One of the roles of the liaison that's been defined in a lot of the documents that we're going to be dealing with is the fact liaison is in some sense a buffer against things going totally wrong in the group. In other words, if things go wrong the liaison is the person that is appealed to, to say, "Is the Chair making the correct assumption about the consensus, you know, of the group? Is the Chair doing the right thing in making sure -- Chair or Vice Chair -- doing the right thing in terms of treating everybody's views equally?"

So we did say, you know, when we previously had this conversation, that we're a small enough group and we could afford to be, you know, more informal about it. And I guess I have a sense of eating our own dog food, and we're talking about, you know, a set of rules and structures that have put in, that we are then going to be asked to deal with.

And so I tend to think that even though you are on the council at the moment as the Chair, and thus would be able to fulfill that portion of the liaison's role to be on the council and be available, I would still sort of caution us to really consider three other aspects of a liaison's role, which is the buffer against things going wrong in making that decision. Thanks.

I'm not saying anything's going to go wrong.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes. Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Welcome everyone. It's nice to kick the meeting off with a little discussion. And I, of course, Avri, I stand on the other side of that argument. But I think the issue here -- and as was brought up and discussed in our first call -- the STI should be a body that is reviewing implementation work where it gets sticky on the other side.

So our job, really, is to try to find solutions where if something that was to be implemented isn't being implemented as was recommended by a working group or some other body. So when it comes to this idea of being a buffer, I think we are that buffer.

Our job is to come back and rethink or try to find ways of solving the sticky things that happen in the implementation side. So my comment in the last call and it remains the same, is that we are a very - we should be a nimble body, we should be a light-touch body.

And so having our Chair be the interlocutor between the end reporting, effectively, back to council I think makes more sense. Otherwise, we're going to be dividing up a lot of responsibilities for different people for, in my view, no reason.

The Chair is privy to everything that's going on. The Vice Chair's privy to everything that's going on. So there should be no reason why we need to add yet another individual with a title. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: So thank well too. Any other comments to that? Not yet? Thank you very much.

So my other (unintelligible) would be, you know, well to keep it practical. So that means - so I would say, okay, I take over though this job around to report to the council and back, as well, in this sense. And in case, if something arises like Avri was mentioning, so that we come to a deadlock.

So, I mean, let's talk about, really then. And we could talk about it, whether which person could really - the best one now to do so and to report that. And so let's keep it practical.

So Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And just to note, as well, because there are three other council members who are actually part of the (signing) committee. So I agree with, well I think if there any issues, there's three other council members that have been part of the discussions and any issues that might have arisen.

So we'll be able to give, I guess, the alternative voice is people feel there needs, you know, Wolf is not doing the appropriate job at council meetings.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay, thank you.

We have to talk about another liaison or liaisons to other groups. But from the last time it was - I think the additional idea, well to ask ALAC, as well, to send a liaison to this group. If there are any other ideas - I would like to do that and then - and to contact ALAC in order to send somebody.

If there are any other ideas with regards to other groups joining us here? I see none. So then let's go to the next point. That is just another (formal one) statement of interest. You know we have been the first group using this online sheet - this online process for providing a statement of interest.

I personally did that and it works fine for me. And I would like to ask the other members still - that still provide it until now or are still in the process of doing that. And so or do we have still problems with doing that? And in this case I would like to ask Julie, do you have some experience if there are still problems with providing SOIs online?

Julie Hedlund: Thank Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. So far we have just three who have used the new system. We could have a few issues that we needed ironed out and thanks to those of you who helped us work them out, in particular, Avri.

So one issue I think that Ken Bour has tried to adjust the form to address is that there is the option for you to restrict your editing rights to that page so that the person who enters the SOI is the only person who can edit that SOI. I think that's important for the integrity of the information.

I think Ken has tried to adjust the form to help make it easier to make that selection or make it more obvious. So I urge you, if you have not tried using the form, to give it a try and to let us know what you think about it. This is - it's not set in stone.

The idea is that this particular group would help us to refine the form and improve it. So we're very, very interested in your comments.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Julie. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: All right, thanks Wolf. Julie, just a quick point. I think I wasn't sure where to get my password from.

Julie Hedlund: If - well, now that you have told me I'll let IT give you a password. And just for those of you who may not know, if you've already used the Wikis and on GNSO, in particular the new confluence Wiki, you would have a password. But those of you who have made - not have used the Wikis would not have a password. And so you do need that.

So if you go to log in and you don't have a password, just let me know and I'll get in touch with our information technology people and they'll assign one to you. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Julie.

So I also would like to encourage you, all the members, well to go to that Wiki page, well, and start inserting your SOI. It's really easy to handle. So - and - so it helps a lot people. It's formalized and it takes five minutes well to do so.

So thank you very much. Well, okay, no question. Thanks.

So now let's move to the main part of this session. It's about our working program. You remember from the charter office group, so we have in the charter two blocks to be covered or in how we should cover our work. So - and this is - the one part is in a more reactive way.

And that means we have a list of - a set of recommendations which have been worked out through our improvement phase -- the GNSO improvement phase -- in recommendations coming from the different working teams. And are going or are already implementation.

And so this is our basis for the work of this standing committee. We have to assess how these recommendations are effectively improved and we have to discuss it. Was it (means) effectively and how it going to be implemented.

So we have, then, in the charter said we should, on the one hand, work in a reactive manner. That means if problems come up - if issues come up from any group within the GNSO they should refer to us and then it should be discussed here in this group. That's the one thing.

And on the other hand, the other points to be made that is more, to work more in an active way. That means preventively working before an issue may arise. Or - and then we could see a - in a clear way that there is something provided which doesn't work - which may not work very well for the different working teams then we pick it up and then provides a solution for that.

So these are the two points how we see our work to be done. And I would like to open the discussion with that. I have sent out some rough ideas from my point of view how we could work. And I would like you all to get on the Adobe -- yes, it's on the Adobe -- to start that and open the discussion and open the discussion for ideas with regards to this potential program.

I see - let me just finish my introductory remarks. For the so-called review on request that means sort of reactive way to work. There was one idea last time, shouldn't we formalize this way how to react so that everybody has a -- let me see -- a sheet of paper or something where he or she could refer to and do it so that it is set down in a more formalized way and brought up to this committee?

And the other thing is set in so the more active part of this working program.

Let's just start -- actually just before we go into details, more generally you will see that in the same way. Is it - are there different ways for us to see

that? And I'll let (resume) the discussion. Are there any ideas, any comments so far? Something on the Adobe? No, no. One?

Man: Thank you, Wolf. So I think just to make it clear, the SCI has no function effectively unless and until the GNSO council flags an issue and comes to us. Is that correct? Is that your reading of the charter?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The charter, to my knowledge, if I recall correctly, so the charter says that an issue could be raised, let me say, in that way and could - should be referred to the SCI. I wonder whether it's going to be (transferred) to the council or not. So if the charter says that, I'm not fully aware of that. Marika, could you help, please?

Marika Konings: The charter actually says that the issue's going to be raised either by the GNSO council or a group charter by the GNSO council. So that could be a working group or a...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...contracting team.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. That - well that answers it. So basically it's a GNSO issue or if there's a working group and it's commissioned to do some work and that working group comes back and has a problem, then we're coming. Thank you.

Marika Konings: I - yes, I don't have the charter in front of me, but didn't it also include sort of a notion of periodicity of certain reviews that would happen on a periodic basis?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, it's saying, okay, we should (is active part) - we should review on a periodic basis because - but the periodicity is not - it's not defined. Not yet.

So at some point we should discuss in case we are going to do that way.

Marika, please?

Marika Konings: It is Marika. In relation to the submission of the request, the charter actually already outlined, as well, the information that would need to be submitted if a request is submitted by either the council or chartering group.

And the questions that are requested to be completed is at first, which group will you represent? Two, to which rules of processes implemented by the OSC or PPSC do you refer? Three, please outline the problems. Four, what specific changes do you propose to address and identify problems? And five, do you have any additional suggestions for making the rules processes easier to administer?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, thank you. So that's very clear. So we know where our input is coming from. And the question is, well how to deal with that input, on the one hand. And on the other hand, are we going well to put use, let me say, input by ourselves or are we going to put use just towards how this input is going to be matched within that group?

So that's what we should talk about today. And let's just talk about this idea about how to standardize a way how these issues are raised so - and how they are - they (unintelligible).

It came to my mind that as we have the same thing just cast in the PDP version teams and are waiting an issue, it's something which was (discussed) to me in the PDP working team and was recommended also how to deal with that and - for the PDP.

So if we don't talk about PDPs here we are talking about issues - any issues coming up with regard to the recommendations. And so I wonder whether we could pick up some elements from the ideas discussed in the PDP environment. And I put some points here on the paper provided.

For example, (HRP), defined it should be - defined what is - what does it mean raising an issue, who can raise an issue. But I think that that was covered right now, so in the charter. And some elements to be covered, for example, the issue should be described, you know, what does it mean? The parties should be clear and know who is raising the issue.

And it should be outlined, if possible, how is the GNSO - I say the GNSO is affected by the issue. Maybe there are other thoughts that are affected by that, but more or less we are looking to recommendations from the GNSO.

And for the fourth point could be what may be the targets if we modify or amend the existing situations or which is touched by that issue. For example, what could be the improvement if it's - in a monetary way if it's effectiveness, is it something else?

So those are the ideas I - which I brought up. So - and I would like to open the floor for that. Mary, please. Good morning.

Mary Wong: Good morning. Thank you, Wolf, and thank you for putting this together. It's quite helpful in getting us started, given that we're starting operations without anything to review at this point, which might be a good thing. But it also makes our job a little harder.

So my thought was that, given what's already been outlined in the charter, and I recall that the discussion there was that it ranged some. We didn't want just anybody to raise an issue because they filed a grievance. And we wanted some safeguards to prevent that, as well as to make sure that the issue being raised is really an issue that's within the purview of this group and the GNSO.

So I thought those steps that we had in the charter was good in framing how it should be done. My suggestion, I think, is to, as we're starting out and, you know, mindful of experiences in other contexts where we really got bogged

down by forms and details and process, my personal preference would be that we have a light touch on this point, at least as we're starting out.

Because I do think that the charter provides enough guidelines. And as long as it's documented and the issue is raised with sufficient clarity, it's always open to us to ask for more details, going back to the original person who arranged it.

So that would be my preference.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Mary.

So I understand that. So - and that's - it should be very - it should be kept on the low level of standardization that means not well to talk too much about formal things here. But the only thing is of that, is that we, in this scope, should be clear what is behind - who could come up and what is his target to deal with those things.

So I think that's very helpful what you're saying. And it could put together on one sheet of paper those points, and that's enough so as a guideline for us.

I just would like to refer to Ron, if I may, so - because you came up with that idea. Is there any additions to that, what was said by Mary on your side?

Ron Andruff: I think Mary captured it exactly right. It's a light touch and it's just moving forward as and when we're needed. I think it's really important to make sure that we establish for ourselves a clear picture and I think this is the difficulty, is that we don't know if it's fish or fowl. We don't know what we're looking at yet, but I think it's really critical that our job is really to try to sort the problem out when the problem arises.

So I think we just have to be light on our feet and keep hands off -- that we do not become this place, this orbiting group that gets its hands in everything. Rather we show up very rarely. That's how I would hope to see it. Thank you.

Man: Okay, Ron. And I see Carlos, please.

Carlos Aguirre: Yes, thanks. Well I agree with Mary. I'm -

Man: Ron.

Carlos Aguirre: Ron, sorry. I think we need a kind of checklist, you know, a form with this - the details to have when you can raise an issue. So the clear form on raise an issue make the future of this issue was successful I think.

Man: Thank you, Carlos. And Marika, please?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm wondering if it might be helpful to develop kind of a one-page that could be used to communicate to the council as well as working groups on the process of approaching the SEI and what information needs to be approached when they approach the SEI, because I think many might be unfamiliar that this committee exists and what issues they can raise and how they should do it. So that might be a way of clearly outlining who's eligible to raise an issue, what issues they can raise, and how they should do it, and that might help getting the right information and also reaching out to those, making them aware that we exist and can help with those issues.

Man: Okay. Thank you, Marika. That's a good idea. So if you agree, I would (unintelligible) and draft a paper for that in cooperation with you with (unintelligible) staff and then give it to your consideration and then we could provide it for the council. Thank you.

So let's go to the second point of the potential working group and review on a periodic - potentially on a periodic timescale. Last time we provided a list of

these recommendations which are provided and which had different status at the time being this regards to the implementation. Some of them are already under implementation, others, for example, the PDP recommendations, is still in stage - in the last stage of before implementation. That means it's just out for public comment again. And so we have different stages and we have to talk about how to deal with them.

When those - so those recommendations have reached a status at first that they are in (unintelligible) or this talk here, (unintelligible). So I would stress this point because it is very important if we are clear which recommendations are we really dealing with.

So it may clear, but the question for me is - and I would like to open discussion on that, is whether we should take, for example, the PDP recommendations in our portfolio right now, before it is, you know, formally finished, or should we start with recommendations only after they have been approved and after they have been started to fully implemented. That's the first question I would like to discuss and the (unintelligible) for that. And then let's talk about a potential prioritization of recommendations with regards to the implementation status. And then let's go step by step. So if there are any ideas with regards to that point I just made?

With regard to the question about when - at what time - at what point those recommendations, we took in our (unintelligible). We take (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) you're specifically commenting on the PDP one. On that one, I think it makes more sense to wait until the board has approved and has been implemented as there might be further changes before it gets to board approval, and it might not make sense to review something that isn't final yet. So that's just specifically on the PDP one.

Man: Mm-hm. Other comments on that? Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Well you're referring to, if I understand you correctly, two elements. One, which Marika just addressed, is a PDP process that Jeff was responsible, Jeff Newman's group, and that's now gone up for public comment and so that's sort of in the works. And then there's the other discussion about when do we engage the trigger points that we kind of talked about the last call, is that correct?

Man: That's the next point. (Unintelligible) point really for me where we put the line, you know, on the - between what's coming in to our group and what (is helping us) really. You know, when I see, for example, the PDP recommendations are, you know, they will come in, you know, to that group as well, at least. They are - I would say, they are ready, you know, I would say, you know, but if it's - in the formal way, it's just for public comment again, and it maybe get some comments. And the question is then, "Should we deal with those comments, or is it up to the other group to deal with them?"

Marika Konings: This is Marika to ask something. The charter itself says that we should review recommendations that have been provided and approved by the GNSO council. So I think in the PDP case, in the - when the comments come back on the PDP, the council may make an assessment and, you know, what any - any changes that need to be made based on the comments, whether that's the PDP work team, I think, most likely or whether the standing committee would be more appropriate maybe at a later date. But after that, it still needs to go through the Board.

For the other recommendations, that wasn't necessary because they didn't, you know, relay their changes to the bylaws. But in the PDP case, they will need to move another step up before it's really finalized. So there is, I think, a second consideration there that although the charter says, "Once approved by the GNSO council in the sense of the PDP," it might make more sense to wait until it's approved by the Board before we actually establish a schedule for reviewing it.

Ron Andruff: Point taken. Thank you, Marika. I think that really clarifies it for my side that this has to go through its full process. And that as described by Marika, is quite clear. It's public comment and the Board approves and then we would take it back up. But I think at this point, it's still really (unintelligible) when he was the chair of that group, and until that's been resolved I don't think there's much there for us to do, but that's my personal opinion. Thank you.

Man: Okay. I see no further comment on that, so we take this point. And then the question is, with regards to the other recommendations, for example, I bring it up. So we have from the - for the (unintelligible) communications working group, so we have recommendations with regards to the toolkits and we have communications with regard to the Web site and others as well which are under implementation. Then we have recommendations from the (unintelligible) the GNSO, whatever that means. I was a member of that. Sorry.

And so they were dealing with all the procedures and that's the thing, you know, we were discussing already, some issues, in the GNSO. And then we have others. We have the working group guidelines from this working team as well and others.

So are there any preferences. If you talk about periodic review from your point, would you would say, "Okay, where we should start with?" Or should we at first discuss about the question itself, "So, should we review on a periodic timescale as it is said out in the charter," which means that we have to be a little bit proactive in doing that? So we have to work out the timeline, which recommendations should be reviewed, and in which context they should be reviewed, and which - under which criteria they should be reviewed?

So that's more general question, which was also discussed the last time. And it was not really discussed, you know. It was not fully discussed, I would say. So I would just bring it up again and ask for comments. Mary, please.

Mary: Just a very brief suggestion, and that's on the point of the groups about to wrap up their work. One way to do this, again, as an initial start without overburdening folks or processes is to have some kind of indicator on the calendar for each group as they're wrapping up to have a meeting with us to just talk through maybe some of the problems that they may have encountered during the process without necessarily doing anything else.

I'm not sure how feasible that is given, you know, the groups and the schedules, but it just seems to me that might be a quick way to alert us to possible issues that might be coming up.

Man: Okay. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. One of the challenges of that will be is that some of those groups have only worked very shortly under the new guidelines, because I mean the most relevant thing, I think, for most of the working groups is the GNSO working group guidelines, and in the future, the new PDP. So I think as most of them were actually already at their end phase of their work when the working group guidelines were adopted, I'm not sure how much they'll be able to, you know, contribute to that, but they definitely would be able maybe raise certain issues that they feel that were missing that could be a part of a periodic review in saying, "Well, is that actually covered in the new guidelines or new recommendations?"

Mary: Right, and that's part of the reason why I think it will be difficult. So I think my suggestion was more intended for going forward when we have new working groups, which I presume we will, and it - maybe specifically for the groups that currently exist, there's some kind of different thing that we need to do with them going forward. I was wondering if as a practice for each working group that we set up that we have a meeting with them towards the end, or at least we have an offer to have a meeting with them towards the end of their work.

Man: Okay. That was, I think, in line with this (unintelligible) last time, I think, and maybe you'll comment on that again.

Man: Yes, I support that, Mary. I think that that's probably a nice way forward. And if I go back and reflect on one of the issues that we had in the - under the OSC working group - the OSC structure and the work team on process, there was the issue of proxy that the CNSO council has wrestled with, and then it came back to the OSC again, and we had to do a lot of rethinking of that, because there was a very small number of people on the work team.

We didn't have the benefit of 25 heads around the table. We had around three or four of us. And therefore, when you're thinking through that process and discussing with staff what's the way - best way going forward, it took a long time to find our way there.

So ultimately, what ended up happening is it got kicked back to OSC, OSC discussed it, it went back to staff, staff came back, so it's been on for some time. And had this body, the SEI, been available at that time, it - the work team might've been able to present this idea. And if it didn't quite sound right, then it could've been refined then rather than coming to GNSO and wasting many months of work. Not wasting, but basically taking up many more months of work.

And I think that's probably a nice light touch and a good way to approach it -- that we offer to a work team if they'd like to flag a couple of issues that they've wrestled with, they could do it on a conference call with us. And at least we're aware of what that issue might be, so we can start thinking about it in advance. That's a good way forward in my view.

Man: Yes, thank you. So basically, the idea of to - really to approach those working teams, and I put it all on paper here. So if we look to the list of working teams

we have at the time being, so I was saying so we have - the one which have finished or almost finished several (unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you.

Man: So that, we have the OSC, for example, it's finished the work, and we have the PDP working team, which is almost - has almost finished the work. And I saw the (Iyalya) RTP and the (Pedna) group providing their report - final reports, so this may be groups we should refer to and talk to them.

So to do that a little bit in a structured way, I would suggest provide some - I will provide some ideas about how to do that, yes, and then so - and which other the questions you will have. And if you have ideas where to put that, I mean, we could exchange a few of the ideas on the list and then maybe already for the next meeting, so we could invite the chairs of those groups or at least the group from the OSC and maybe from the PDP working team, because they are very familiar with those processes.

If you have some additional ideas with regard to working groups, we could also invite the chair of the working group work team, so which - those chairs which have provided - those teams which have provided already their reports and ask for ideas.

Okay. So the one idea was, for example, for which regards with the working group guidelines (unintelligible) also because all work teams are touched by this, the implementation of those guidelines, to get some reflection on that. So how is it used, these guidelines, by those groups, for example, and what is their experiences with those guidelines and (unintelligible).

I wonder - for example, there was another point (unintelligible) which is under implementation by staff. I wonder whether this is already in a status that we could deal with that and get some experience with implementation of that. I think that should be referred to staff, for example, and asked staff

(unintelligible) who are preparing and implementing that on whether this is in a status that they could refer to constituencies and stakeholder groups in order to ask their experience with that.

I wonder, for example, our (unintelligible) we don't - have not yet any experience with that, but maybe others have already. So then their experience would be very helpful to know.

So with regards to the - coming back to the question of the (unintelligible) of reviewing, are there ideas from your point of view? Do you see any points or at what stage we should go for review for that recommendation?

One point could be, for example, so we have an overall implementation of improvements within ICANN. You know this structural Implementation Committee chaired by (unintelligible), so he - so they are supervising the overall implementation process where GNSO is one part of. And we were agreeing that we should also contact them with our working program to know from them what is - what are their assessment criteria with regards to the improvement implementation. So that could be one point.

So, there is an overall (unintelligible) for that, if I remember very well, coming also down from the overall (unintelligible) that maybe within three or four years within ICANN that there is a kind of review circle. So should we look through that circle, or do we have any priorities to (unintelligible) come back to say, "Okay, this is a recommendation which we should start with immediately and go through that review process right now."

I'm wondering whether there are ideas from your sides or do you see it more in that way, "Okay, let's wait and see," let me say. In that way, let's wait and see what would happen. So if somebody's going to try and come up with ICANN's circle just to get a feeling on that. It's - what is your idea? What is your - would you - what would be your preference on that?

Well, maybe there are also people from out there, from other groups, that would say, "Okay, we have an instant problem, so just figure it out, and deal with it right now." So there are - just to trigger that discussion a little bit, so last time, there was - going that way, we seemed to be a little bit formal about, because I was saying, "Okay, if you would like to go that way, then we have to go more deeply into the details of (unintelligible) so we have to know what is in the recommendation." And we have to ask, "Okay, is that a point that could be problematic or not?" and then we do that.

So I'm open for both ways to do it, so - but I would like to get a feeling of what people are thinking about that. To get a feeling of (unintelligible) the kind of (unintelligible) activity which we're dealing with here.

I understand. So the very first meeting here in Singapore, very early meeting, early morning, (unintelligible) 4:00 in the morning right now that we're in, so it's not easy, you know, (unintelligible) such matters. But I - comment on that?

Avri Doria: Yes, you've been working so hard to get comments, so I figured that we'd try to get a comment. I would think that just looking around and at how inactive we are on the subject of proactivity would be a good indicator that we do not intend to be proactive.

Man: Thank you. Thank you, Avri. So, you know, I wouldn't - you know, (unintelligible) with my in proactivity. So if you say that very clear, so I would say, "Okay, that is for the time being," then we would come up with - you know, deal with it - with those things in a more reactive way at first. And we can change that, also, in future.

So, if, for example, there is - from council of other group there is more pressure coming on us, well, to do this thing, so that it could be done as well. Ron, please.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. I think that it's wise that we put a SCI meeting on every ICANN agenda. Every time we meet, we should be getting together and at least just kind of looking at if there's anything on the horizon or if there's something that - you know, that we've heard in the hallways or, you know, through other dialogue with other colleagues that we can bring forward.

But I think at this stage of the game, Avri's comment is quite well taken. There's not much for us to do at this stage, so I think rather than trying to cast something in stone that we're going to live by, let's kind of just play it by ear.

Man: Comment, please?

Woman: Yes. It's an interesting idea putting a meeting on every schedule. I think if we do, we should consider it, though, mostly as a "Come and tell us what worked and didn't work in the various groups you are in" type of meeting to make sure that we haven't missed anything. I don't know that we actually need a meeting for the sake of meeting, but if it serves as a way to get people to come and comment on problems and perhaps even things that worked if there are things that worked, that could be a good thing.

Man: Okay. One comment from Mary, please.

Marilyn Cade: I would - Marilyn Cade, speaking. I would actually make this comment as the chair of the business constituency. I think it's a good idea for you to retain the meeting. I think, in fact, it's impossible to predict right now what kind of issues are going to be emerging over the next three to six months depending on decisions that are made - taken at this particular ICANN meeting and also because you can't predict what decisions might implicate GNSO and GNSO council activities driven by the ATIT. And once you lose a meeting slot, my experience is that you're going to find it very difficult to get it back, because it will be filled by something else.

Man: Thank you very much. So I think that's a good point, well, that we could come to an end right now (unintelligible) and the chair of the council. But, okay, there is a very last comment from Carlos. Okay.

Carlos Aguirre: Short comment. Good point Marilyn and Ron, because it's a first meeting, like, you said, Wolf. I think we need a kind of checklist, I repeat, for our work, but our work also depends on the issue that we try. Maybe when we have some point to try over the - on the table, so we can define well how (unintelligible) precisely work. Thank you.

Man: Thank you, Carlos. Thank you very much. And I think we come to an end right now to put the poll together. And thank you very much for being here. And, yes, the meeting is closed and recording should be cut. Thank you.

END