

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting  
Thursday, 10 December 2015 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the Thursday 10 December 2015 at 18:00 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-10dec15-en.mp3>

**Attendees:**

Anne Aikman Scalese – IPC – Primary – Chair  
Amr Elsadr – NCUC - Primary  
Angie Graves – BC – Primary  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary  
Lori Schulman – IPC - Alternate  
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC –Primary – Vice Chair  
Martin Pablo Silva Valent – NPOC - Alternate

**Apologies:**

Stefania Milan – NCSG - Alternate  
Julie Hedlund - Staff

**ICANN Staff:**

Mary Wong  
Glen de Saint Géry  
Michelle DeSmyter  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings have started thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you (Barbie). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the standing committee on improvement implementation meeting on Thursday the 10th of December, 2015.

On the call today we have Rudi Vansnick, Amr Elsadr, Angie Graves, Martin Silva, Lori Schulman and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. We have apologies from Julie Hedlund.

From staff we have Mary Wong, Glen de Saint Gery, Michelle DeSmyter and myself Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Terri. Rudi for the transcript and welcome all to this standing committee call. I think that we will probably see (Antonio) a bit later on.

I suppose you have all received the email with the agenda and the text that has been proposed that was drafted by Julie, thanks to Julie for doing this. We can start with the agenda items presented.

First point on the agenda is (order) of consideration of the current request from the GNSO council. And the first one is the current practice in relation to motions.

I don't know if you can put up the text. Yes thank you, this is the text that has been presented to the GNSO council in Dublin. It has been discussed and maybe we will find the text that we got back from the council.

The GNSO council requests that we send (unintelligible) improvement of organization. (Unintelligible) the existence (unintelligible) practices of the GNSO council and that is completed so far.

If we believe that the current practices are in the top here then the SCI should convey its reasons for that release to the council and develop (unintelligible)

of motions and amendments to motions and that should be the next step to consider.

We sent a letter to the GNSO council for consideration in the Dublin meeting and there would be another letter on the resubmissions (unintelligible) and the council acknowledged the two letters.

But it is unclear whether the summary provided by the SCI are separately considered at the (unintelligible). And maybe I can call on Amr who is our GNSO council liaison.

And if there is a need for us to dig much deeper into this issue or if we can consider that it has been accepted by the council.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi this is Amr. Okay my understanding of where we stand right now on this is that the GNSO council asked the SCI to look into sort of formalizing the procedures by which motions are submitted and seconded.

What we did as a committee first before start beginning to work on this was to document what we believed was the current practice of submitting motions and the seconding them and so forth and we sent that as part of the letter that Rudi was briefing us on to the GNSO council.

If I am not mistaken I think the council said this was okay that the current process is okay and now we need to pick up on I guess to - on formalizing this by somehow considering how to include it in the GNSO operating procedures and perhaps also in reviewing the print practice, determine whether we believe that there are any changes that need to be made.

And if there are I guess we need to communicate this to the GNSO council. That's where I think we left things off if I forgot anything or if I misspoke I'd be happy to be corrected by Rudi or perhaps Julie or Mary, thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr. Rudi for the transcript. I see Mary you have your hand up, you have the floor.

Mary Wong: Yes I did raise my hand, thank you Rudi and thank you Amr. This is not to contradict you at all but to say that you have summarized it as staff understood it.

The only thing that I and Julie because we talked about this before the call would add is that because this was a letter to the council it was not something that was necessary for the council to vote on to accept and I think Amr you know all of this so I'm just explaining it for the transcript and for our newer members.

So our understanding from the Dublin meeting was that the document was circulated in good time for the council and so, you know, if any councilor had any concerns or inaccuracies were spotted that they would raise those.

And given that that was not the case the chair at the time Jonathan Robinson then considered that this item was closed for the time being from the council's perspective without needing more formal action from the council.

And that's why as Amr and Rudi have said we can now proceed to the next step of the request which is for this group the SCI to consider if these steps which we can now consider as accurately reflecting the current council practice are indeed ideal.

And if so they should therefore be put into the operating procedures as Amr has suggested or if indeed the SCI feels that certain things may be improved or there are gaps then we would need to discuss these and go back to the council to explain why we want to change the current practice.

So either codify as is or propose a change to be codified and go back to the council with that. Thanks Amr and thanks Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Mary. Rudi for the transcript. Yes I think that is quite clear now that our next step should be the consideration to review the GNSO operational procedures in order to figure out if we have to do some modifications.

I think if I'm not wrong it's Section 4.3 where we have motions and voting. If we need to modify the text yes or no I think it's the question that we need to resolve here is at that level is it something we need to do at that level in Section 53 or should we consider that the text was actually (unintelligible) and present in the procedures and are clear enough.

So I'm looking to our group here if there are any ideas about going for a revision of Section 4.3 or we think that there is actually no need to do some modifications there. I'm just wondering if somebody has some opinions on this.

Yes Amr you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi this is Amr. Well I believe one constructive approach may be to - first we do need to develop new text for the operating procedures whether we decide that the current practice needs to be changed or not because there is no language that addresses any of this whether the current practice or an amended one that we may suggest in the operating procedures now.

So but the approach that I would suggest is before actually working on that text is to go through the current practice thoroughly. Just determine whether we do actually feel that any changes need to be made.

We should probably have a lengthy discussion about any changes we do feel need to be made. I don't know if we do yet or not but, you know, we could do that.

And once we've settled on a process then we can probably begin to develop text to be included in the operating procedures. And as Mary has noted we have to - before we actually suggest changes to the operating procedures or to the current practice not the operating procedures I guess. But if we do actually have suggestions for changes to the current practice as Mary has indicated we need to go back to the GNSO council and explain why we feel these changes are needed and perhaps get the councils input as well.

And then so perhaps we could also do this before actually working on definitive sort of text or we may have some form of draft ready by then but that's just my suggestion.

And the other thing is that we do also have another project requested by the GNSO council which is also up on the agenda. So I guess one way to work on both of these simultaneously is perhaps to create some teams to address them in between our calls and then report back to the group both on this and during SCI calls. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Amr. Indeed we have another group list on the table and that's one that needs also a lot of attention and some kind of urgency in order to manage that one.

I see also (Lori) you have your hand up, you have the floor.

Lori Schulman: Yes I just wanted to second (Amar's) suggestion about dividing these two projects into teams. I think that is really important because so many of us now are working in multiple workgroups or multiple issues particularly with the transition.

So I think it would be a better use of everybody's time if we could break up into small groups, get some conclusions and recommendations and then have the group work on the projects and vote.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Lori) that's indeed a great idea I think it's the best way to move forward yes indeed, we're looking for two groups each group looking to the individual requirements for a definition.

Yes Mary you have the floor.

Mary Wong: Thank you Rudi. So just adding the staff perspective on this and following up on (Amar's) comment in the chat that as to whether either of these projects are urgent.

You know, looking at first of all the workload of the community and of the council and secondly when these practices normally invoked we would say that the topic that we're discussing now the, you know, practice in relation to proposing, seconding and amending motions would be probably the one that would merit first consideration because the elections issue we obviously don't want to put that up for too long but we will have some time to work on that.

So if the SCI would like to break up into teams I mean this may not be relevant as an observation but on that score while that's an excellent suggestion ideally we're a little concerned about getting participation on the teams for two reasons.

One is that, you know, we have had spotty attendance at our SCI meetings for completely understandable reasons. And I think one of the main understandable reasons recently is the point that I think Rudi you made that there is a lot of focus now on accountability and the transition.

So in other words I guess what the staff is suggesting is to have this group consider whether you want to do the projects simultaneously in which case the team approach is probably ideal.

But if you were also to decide that it's not necessary to do so simultaneously then you could approach these projects in the order that we have them in the agenda. Thanks Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Mary. Rudi for the transcript. Well indeed I think we can categorize that the first one is of the highest priority as that can in fact happen at any moment.

Although I'm just wondering in case we are losing the - for any reason losing the chair of GNSO the elections of the chair becomes critical again. Not that I'm calling for losing the chair but I'm always trying to look into the baddest situations and find the solution for it.

So I consider that in priority a note quite important but I agree that perhaps the most important one today is getting an answer for the first one the current practices in relation to the motions.

And I remember that even in Buenos Aires I mean in Dublin you had the discussion about (send) the amendments and so on. But it's taken quite a lot of discussion and it's something that probably needs more attention in the actual procedures.

So maybe we can have a feeling of the room and the group in looking for participants for the first group looking to the current practice in relation to motions. Who is interested in that one you can put your hand up then I should eventually (unintelligible) the groups.

We aren't taking any decisions today because we need to go back to the meeting and ask the others in the group who are joining that one. Mary I see your hand up is a new one?

Mary Wong: It is Rudi and I apologize for speaking so much. And this is to agree with the point that you just made to go back to the mailing list and the staff will do that after this call.

One supplemental suggestion to that is that Amr has volunteered to work on both which is great because, you know, the suggestion that I was about to



make was that subject of course to their preferences it would be good if the SCI members that are either past or present council members could assist with the first topic because they would be the ones with the most direct hands on experience of whether it's working or not working. So that was it.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Mary and yes not talking too much it's helpful, you are have a lot of experience in your day job at ICANN staff and we are occasionally jumping into this stuff.

It's a great idea and I know that - I suppose that's Wolf is still on the call. I would like to eventually hear from him if he is willing to join that team because he has also the experience being on the council.

Terri Agnew: And this is Terri and Wolf-Ulrich just sent an email. He was unable to stay connected due to connectivity issues.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay, thank you Mary. Rudi for the transcript. Well let's go on with this request and I propose the following that staff will send a message to the SCI members and request who will participate in what team.

We will create two teams. The first one on the relation to the motions and amendments the discussions that we have already. And the second one looking to the new issue that is on the table about the GNSO officer elections and especially on the chair election that we had this issue in Dublin where we were not able to have a chair.

It was clear that some procedures were missing in helping the GNSO getting through this in an appropriate way.

So that's the proposal. I don't know if there is any objection to proceeding as such. If not then - yes Amr you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi this is Amr. I just wanted to be clear have we decided to work on both simultaneously or are we going to work on one project and then the other? I just wasn't very clear on that thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr. Rudi for the transcript. Well I think that we need to take consideration that we are human and something can happen. And the second question is as important as the first one.

And then both need to look into the actual procedures so I think it would not be bad to do it in parallel. Maybe we discover stuff that is requesting more attention and having both of them look into a decision I think is not a bad case.

So I would prefer that we do it simultaneously so that we are able to get (unintelligible) the latest for the Marrakesh meeting which is in fact only three months, two months and a half from today.

Do we agree that work in parallel on those two? Amr is agreeing. I don't see any objections so I would consider that we agree that that is the process we are going to follow.

Probably (unintelligible) will send a message to the group today or tomorrow inviting participants for both teams. And I would prefer that we pick up on once we have the groups formed that we pick up on this our mail and consider having some first responses at the next SCI call.

Thanks Mary for following up on this. So perhaps we can leave (unintelligible) today and have more in depth discussions once the teams are good.

The second item on the agenda is the SCI chair, vice chair elections, nominations and staff update. (Unintelligible) actually the request for the second issue which is procedures for officer election at the GNSO.

And we already have been looking through our - under Section 2.2 B, F and G. I have been looking through them and perhaps it would be good if (unintelligible) that we'll jump into this one.

We'll go to the text and get some ideas on how to eventually propose some changes or explanations to the process as described today. And I think essentially the big one would be the 2.2B which is (unintelligible) five sub points.

We (handled) F and we have the situation where in the event that the GNSO council has not elected the GNSO council chair by the end of the previous chair's term the vice chair could serve as interim GNSO co-chair until a successful election can be held.

I think that was the case in fact that happened in Dublin and although I think that there was the question about is it the standing vice chair because normally the vice chairs are ending their service and term at the same time as the chair.

If I'm not wrong I believe we will have to call on Amr who has a lot more experience in the council. Is that correct Amr is the - are the vice chairs ending their term at the same as the chair is ending?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi this is Amr. Yes I believe the question in the request specific to the vice chairs is a matter, is also a matter that may be problematic at times if in the event if a new council chair and vice chairs are not elected I believe the operating procedures indicate that the existing vice chairs may continue as interim vice chairs until new ones are elected.

However the operating procedures don't address whether those - the sitting vice chairs may need to actually leave council whether because they are not some beginning a second term or whether they are term limited and they need to leave council.

So there's a gap in the operating procedures in the event that that may happen. So I believe that was one of the four requests that were submitted to this committee to look into. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr indeed that's I think one of the issues that needs clearance as when we read the paragraph F it's clear it's not mentioned it's the - what happens is the vice chairs are end term.

They normally cannot stay on and as such so that the interim GNSO could chair. Mary I see you have your hand up. You have probably some explanation for this?

Mary Wong: I did and again it's to followup and add to (Amar's) accurate summary. And this is really again for those members with new or veteran members who are not as familiar with, you know, the operating procedures or this particular topic.

And in helping Wolf-Ulrich prepare this request to the council I think it was very clear that the request needed to be very specific otherwise you sort of go round and round in circles of Section 2.2.

So that's why as you noted Rudi there is really four questions which is described in this Section 5 of the request. And if you look to Section 6 that's where the explanation or the context for these four topics are laid out.

And specific to what you and Omar have just discussed it is a gap in the GNSO operating procedures as Amr noted and that arises because under the ICANN bylaws there is a provision that expressly says and it's here in Section 6 of the document in front of you that, you know, the term of both the chair and the vice chairs cannot be longer than one year.

It doesn't say when that year begins but it does say elsewhere that every council member serves from AGM to AGM. However this particular section

also says that the GNSO council can specify the term as long as it's not longer than a year.

And the GNSO council has never done so and that is the gap in the operating procedures that I believe Amr was speaking about. So it is not for the SCI to recommend changes to the bylaws unless the group feels that actually that is necessary because that obviously is a step up from what we are chartered to do which is to look at the GNSO operating procedures and other things we need to happen.

But I just wanted to let people know what the context is that there is a framework in the bylaw that says maximum one year for the chair and the vice chairs but the council can specify a term less than that.

And there is a separate section that says, you know, every council member serves from AGM to AGM. So hopefully that's clearer in terms of not just how this arose in this past election cycle but sort of where our limitations and the scope lie. Thanks Rudi, thanks Amr.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Mary for the clarification and Rudi for the transcript. I consider that we stick to the bylaws. We are not going to try to change the bylaws.

There will probably be some changes due to the IANA transition but we would not look into that specifically I suppose. That's why we're looking to the issue on how to solve the problem and it's term is one year.

It's clear that when we have to do the election of a chair of the GNSO council we have (unintelligible) the vice chairs (unintelligible) chair normally also. So we have to solve the issue of what happens when the vice chairs are end term and they have to take the interim position as co-chairs.

(Unintelligible) they could normally not do it so we would have a GNSO without any chairing positions. That I think is the summary of the issue itself. And I don't know if we want to have a discussion today on this already.

I think we have (unintelligible) of what is requested to do. And I would leave it up to the team that is going to dig into the (unintelligible) to come forward with some ideas and proposals on this one.

Is that acceptable for everybody? I see Amr agreeing. Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Rudi. This is not to disagree at all surely it will be for the sub-team to dive more deeply into this as you note. But again it is for those members that haven't been following this discussion at the council level.

This is one of the four issues and they are not necessarily interrelated. So that group will have quite a bit of work to do in looking more deeply into each of the four issues.

For example one of the other issues which also came out in Dublin - well actually this came up prior to Dublin. So this is an issue that wasn't directly related to the actual election that was held in Dublin but is the question of who is eligible to stand for chair.

And we're described that in this document so I won't go through it but just to note that there are four issues not all of which are interrelated. So like I said the team will have some work to do.

And of course, you know, hopefully the council members who are members of the SCI will be able to assist that team as well at least in advising it.

Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Mary. Yes sorry that I - Rudi for the transcript, that I cut it off to the one specific issue that I was highlighting but I think that's the real critical one

that was going to require a lot of time and energy to get propositions that will stand.

So okay let's hand over the issues to the sub-team so that they can take action and then do the appropriate work. And I hope we can have the teams form in the next two or three week's maximum.

We probably need to have a call early January before we have the next GNSO council meeting so that we can eventually have a little discussion back to the council at that time.

Does that work for everyone?

Mary Wong: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you. So may I consider that we can close the agenda (unintelligible) one and we have something like 19 minutes to go on this call? I'm not urging, Amr I'm not urging (unintelligible) I'm trying to urge everybody to make a decision which team they would like to go so that we can finally start it and have the work started up early next year if possible.

I know that the council has all sorts - a quite heavy agenda for the moment with the IANA transition, IANA accountability. Discussions that are requiring some decisions before the year end and having final discussions on meetings in early January.

So I will say thank you for making this process started and I would like to move on with the agenda item 2.3 where we need to have elections of the chair and vice chair of this standing committee that the list is served for the year 2016 as the committee operates year by year, calendar year.

I think that we still have some time to make final decisions in addressing the chair and vice chair elections. Although I think it's something that has to be

done if I'm not wrong needs to be done before the year end. Mary is that correct do we need to have a chair, vice chair for 2016 at the year end?

Mary Wong: Hi Rudi this is Mary again and the charter for the SCI does specify that the time period would be December. It doesn't actually lay out a timetable so presumably in December as I think Julie did a week or two ago she stated the nomination process.

It really does depend on whether or not there is more than one candidate or either the - for either the chair or the vice chair because if there is not then obviously things will go rather quickly.

If you'll indulge me I'll go real quickly through the process if there actually is more than one candidate for either position. And if it is for the chair then there needs to be an email election with the results to be tallied after one week.

And the losing candidate if there are two candidates will have the option of accepting the vice chair position. So the significance of this is that the - if you have two candidates for chair then presumably who fills the vice chair position will not be known until that election is actually held.

Similarly for the vice chair position if there is more than one candidate then there needs to be an election by email with a one week tally as well. So it goes on there is more to it than that but Rudi your question about the timeline was, you know, we probably would like to have nominations in shortly.

And I noticed that Wolf-Ulrich has now joined the call again so welcome Wolf-Ulrich and it is very timely because one of the questions that Wolf had been asking was when we would close the nomination.

So it would be up to this group to decide when you want to close the nomination. It's the 10th of December you might want to give say another



week and then at that point we will see how many nominees there are for both positions and decide whether or not an election should be held.

We can do the election relatively quickly and like I noted earlier, you know, we need to tally the results after a week. So if we do it that way then chances are you will have a new chair and hopefully also vice chair starting in January.

I hope that's clear and Rudi I'm sorry if I rambled on and Wolf-Ulrich I hope you joined in time to hear this particular discussion. So again the staff suggestion is you keep the nomination open for perhaps up to another week and then conduct an election. An election is necessary by the end of the year.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much for this clear explanation Mary that was needed. And I know that we still have some time to go for final nominations. That there is not that urgent situation.

Although I remember that we had in Dublin the discussion and the question from (Anne) asking me personally if I was willing to stand for the chair position which in fact I'm willing to accept.

I didn't - actually we had the discussion today and that I'm eventually willing to be a candidate for the chair position. I see Amr you have your hand up, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi and thanks Mary for going over the election process and schedule again. I have one comment an issue that I've been aware of for quite some time but it hasn't actually been much of a problem until perhaps this year's elections.  
And that concerns also the elections that are held in the NCUC and the NCSG. Those elections, the elections for the NCSG executive committee and councilors as well as the NCUC executive committee elections happen pretty late in the year.

The new NCUC executive committee has just been seated in the past week. So my concern is when new teams come on board in terms of management of the stakeholder group and constituencies there isn't very much time for them to either confirming the appointments of the SCI members for the next year or perhaps changing them.

And if changes are acquired as will probably be the case this year with the non-commercial stakeholder group then the incoming members don't have time, may not have enough time to either be nominable, they can't be nominated if they choose to.

And they also they may not be in a position to understand who to vote for coming in if they're coming in real quick. I don't have a solution for this and I'm not suggesting that we do solve this issue this year.

I just wanted to point it out and I do think I need to talk to the NCUC executive committee members and maybe work out something on that end. If not I should also - I just want to voice that concern with the SCI and perhaps bring this back a little later to discuss it further. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr. Rudi for the transcript. Yes indeed we have some issues with election and the process of having elections at different times within the organization doesn't make things easier.

And yes well we have to stick to our charter that's one of the issues although we can eventually in the future have a look into how we can change these procedures to allow the stepping up of newcomers and in the very later time of the year.

Wolf-Ulrich I don't know if you want to address this point. I think you're on the (unintelligible) now. Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Rudi, thanks Amr. While Wolf-Ulrich is typing his comment I just wanted to note from the staff perspective that one complication of course is that each stakeholder group and constituency is managed by that particular stakeholder group and constituency as part of the bottom up process we have at ICANN.

At the same time then the other processes that are managed by the council of the manager of the PDP. So it may be somewhat inevitable that some of these problems arise.

Having said that the SCI because of the charter where we have the December nomination and the presumption that the new chair and vice chair starts in January.

The SCI therefore works on a more calendar year basis. And on this I guess I have two observations. One is that in terms of membership to the SCI it is of course as everybody knows up to each stakeholder group or constituency to determine who participates but that isn't limited obviously to office holders to councilors.

So on that note I think the councils hope is that there can be participation and on that I'm thinking particularly that, you know, it would be helpful for someone who it might be a past councilor or someone who may never have been on the council or an office holder within a stakeholder group or constituency but may have been an active working group participant because that sort of perspective is needed on the (unintelligible) as well.

So hopefully that observation helps, you know, in terms of the timing of the membership and the workload. And at this point the observation I would make is that although I don't think this is something staff would recommend at the current time is that if in the course of its work the SCI feels that either the nomination period like in December or the calendar year work plan doesn't actually help because it makes it harder for the various constituent groups.

And that is something that this group should bring up to the GNSO council.  
So I just wanted to add those two points. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Mary. Rudi for the transcript. Yes I was also thinking about when we think about the calendar year if we could align with all the elections in the getting stakeholder groups and constituencies so that we are able to take up onboard the new members before we have to change a vice chair of the standing committee that would be quite helpful.

As I see that today we don't have any members from the nominating committee and we know they have been formed recently also. That could eventually help us in getting a good alignment of (votes) and participants in the standing committee.

I'm reading the chat just in case there is something important. (Unintelligible) and it's only in case we are not able to solve the issue that we need to look into the charter I agree Amr.

So could we consider that we keep the nomination period open until end of next week? That would be the 17th if I am not wrong. Which allows us to have another week to get the elections going on so that we are able to end the process at the year end.

Is that something we can agree on? Yes Mary I see you have your hand up.

Mary Wong: Thank you Rudi. I've just been looking at the calendar and maybe not all the new members are aware but I think the veterans are that the ICANN offices are closed from Christmas through New Year's Day.

So working backwards from that and presuming that nobody actually wants to vote on Christmas Eve even if you don't celebrate it it is something that tends to either be a holiday or a day where folks are traveling regardless of your affiliation.

Our suggestion would be to close the nomination period on the Tuesday which is the 15th. And the reason is not just the staff closure issue but also because I think this announcement has gone out for quite some time.

And the 15th does seem to be at least convenient because it's a memorable cutoff date. So if I can get the notes from today's call out to the list by today I wonder if Rudi and the members of the call can agree that we can stop accepting nominations on the 15th.

So that at staff we can open the balloting within the next day or so and get a full period for the voting and the count.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Mary. Rudi for the transcript. Yes that to me it's a great proposal. I'm completely with you on that date for the 15th. It seems to me that's just a week from now.

It should be enough to have nominations get in and that allows the NCUC also to have their talks inside the constituency and make a proposal. I know that Amr is also involved in the NCUC and probably can get some results before the 15th.

And as I said I am willing to accept the proposal that (Anne) dumped on the table in Dublin but I will formalize that on the meeting later on today. So we would consider the nominations ending the 15th, Thursday so allowing us to have seven days in total after that for the voting.

And that would bring us up to the 23d of December. I think that can work and have the issue solved before Christmas and then we can have a nice Christmas dinner. Is everybody agreeing on having the closing date on the 15th of December?

We probably need - Mary to drop that down the - on the mailing list also that we are closing the nominations on the 15th so that we can go on with the process as a confirmation of today's call.

Okay, well in that case this issue will be solved also. Coming to the last point of the agenda calls for the (unintelligible) of the different stakeholders and constituencies.

And from (ISPC) there was no change mentioned on the mailing list from (BC). We have no changes needed but as I'm looking through the Web site weekly I see that integrates its primary member but that still no alternating members (unintelligible) or is that because there is a mission update on the Wiki?

And I see that from the nominating committee we have no primary and no alternating member. So we probably need to call on the nominating committee to assign these members to the group.

Amr you have your hand up you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi. I was just going to address the NCUC and NCSG appointees. I didn't mean to interrupt you I apologize.

Rudi Vansnick: Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: So just as I said the new NCUC executive committee with new chair and then a bunch of new executive committee members who have just been seated in the past week but I will try to get a decision from them as quickly as possible on whether there are changes to the NCUC team primary and alternates if any changes will be made.

However the non-commercial stakeholder group which I do not represent on this committee I happen to know because I am involved with their policy

committee that makes these appointments so I do know that the NCSG will indeed be making changes to both the primary and alternate members.

So and it's very likely that we already have our two candidates and I will make sure that the SCI has the names of those two members very soon. I do apologize for the delay in that. I was hoping to have this information ready before today's call.

And just also just to - I just wanted to also just ask for a clarification on the NomCom appointees. If I'm not mistaken it's not NomCom that appoints members to this committee but I think we need to represent this from the NomCom appointees to the GNSO council to be represented on this committee as well. That is if I recall the charter correctly. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr. Yes and indeed I could also have a chat with (Capone) as I'm in the NCSG executive committee and get this going on in the next few days so that we have the two candidates for the NCSG.

Yes Mary I see you have your hand up.

Mary Wong: Yes thank you and just quickly first of all Amr you're correct that we talk about NomCom appointees to the SCI it is from the NomCom councilors on the GNSO council.

And an action item for staff from the last SCI meeting was to contact the NomCom councilors because we do have new NomCom councilors and find out who would be the primary and who would be alternate and we don't have confirmation on that yet but we will followup again.

Secondly on the point about new members, Rudi we will put this as another action item and in the email to send to the list because it does have a consequence in that if any group is intending to have new members then they

should probably be the ones that vote for the next chair if they're confirmed before the chair elections if any actually take place.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Mary. Yes indeed it would be appropriate that the new members would be on the list and active in the group in the standing committee so that they are able to vote for the upcoming elections.  
See (Anne), yes (Anne) you are present at the call. Yes probably you have a different time zone, probably the reason why you just came in. Are you on the Adobe Connect bridge?

Thank you (Anne) and she is only on the (unintelligible) she is not on the other. Yes well (Anne) we were just at the end of our agenda today. And definitely the (unintelligible) of the members of the standing committee.

And we have taken care of the two other items on the agenda which would be on the mailing list to date, actions we need to take there. We decided to have sub-teams for handling the two issues on the table coming from the council and the current practice in raising motions and the GNSO officer election.

And so that's taken care of and we are still in the process of...

(Anne): Hello everyone.

Rudi Vansnick: Hi (Anne), yes go ahead (Anne).

(Anne): I really apologize I had this on the calendar as the wrong time somehow. Did you guys have a good meeting? Rudi did you run the meeting?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes (Anne) and I was just coming to the end of the meeting. So good that you are here to close the meeting of today. As I said we took care of the two important items on the agenda the order of the position of the term request which we decided to have two teams, sub-teams each looking into one of the



items that are on the table being the current practice in relation to motions and the second one being the GNSO officer election.

So that two teams could work independently on the issue and we decided to have the nomination period open until next Thursday the 15th so that we can stay in line with the calendar and not having elections ending after Christmas as ICANN's offices are closed between Christmas and New Year's.

(Anne): Okay that's great it sounds like a really good plan. I apologize profusely to everyone on the call and it sounds like you handled it extremely well which leads to my desire actually to nominate you Rudi for chair for next year and I'll be turning that in in written form as well.

So congratulations on that and I think I'll probably just be listening to the transcript as to what was decided on the call. And I'm sorry I had it on the wrong time.

So Rudi you will accept the nomination for chair won't you?

Rudi Vansnick: Well I expressed that you already asked me to step in as chair in Dublin and I told the group that I'm accepting the position and I will do it on the main list to be in informal way.

And indeed sorry Amr that I said Thursday I'm just also conflicting dates it's really in a rushing time of the year now and this is Tuesday the 15th that we are closing the nominations so that we will be in time.

(Anne): Okay very good and I do also want to confirm our IPC representatives because I see (Lori) is not on here. So I guess I'm the only one from IPC coming in quite late but we did confirm that I remain primary and (Lori) remains alternate for the IPC on the SCI.

Rudi Vansnick: By the way (Anne) - Rudi for the transcript. (Lori) was on the call but she dropped off not that long ago but she was on the call. So we had quite a good call.

(Anne): Okay great, thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: I don't know if there is any other business we need to take care of now? Perhaps the question that - the only question that is open is about the next call. When should we have the next call should it still be this year or are we shuffling over to next year?

(Anne): Well probably next year I would say. I don't know what your thinking is but it does get to be a very busy time of year but maybe you should call it since it's likely you'll end up chairing.

Rudi Vansnick: Well I see Mary has her hand up, yes Mary.

Mary Wong: Yes thanks Rudi and thanks (Anne) and welcome. So just to recap some of the chat on this point. If we are going ahead with the sub-teams and it sounds like you approve of that (Anne).

The suggestion is to have those sub-teams formed ideally within the next two or three weeks and then give them at least a month to start on their work which would then mean that it might make sense for the next SCI meeting to be sometime in February.

(Anne): Okay.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Mary that allows us to have a decent end of year festivities and enjoy some receptions and bring out the New Year too. So (Anne) I am giving you the floor as you are the chair coming in now.

If there is any other questions we need to take care of up to you.

(Anne): I'm sorry I don't have anything further. This is (Anne) and I just will actually leave the adjournment to you Rudi since you've been running the meeting I think that would be more appropriate.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay in that case well I think that there is no other questions that we need to take care of and I would like to thank everybody for joining the call and having a good discussion.

As we said we are going to have action minutes on mail later today. Thank you all and have a nice afternoon, nice evening until next year.

(Anne): Thank you Rudi. Thanks Mary and Julie bye-bye.

Mary Wong: Thanks everybody bye.

Terri Agnew: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

(Barbie) if you can please stop all recordings.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you staff.

END