

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting  
Thursday, 17 September 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, 17 September 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-17sep15-en.mp3>

**Attendees:**

Rudi Vansnick – NPOC – Primary – Vice Chair  
Amr Elsadr – NCUC - Primary  
Avri Doria – NCSG – Primary  
Lori Schulman – IPC - Alternate  
Angie Graves – BC – Primary  
Jennifer Standiford – RrSG – Primary  
Anne Aikman Scalese – IPC – Primary - Chair

**Apologies:**

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary

**ICANN Staff:**

Julie Hedlund  
Marika Konings  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the SCI call on Thursday the 17th of September 2015. On the call today we have Jennifer Standiford, Amr Elsadr, Angie Graves, Avri Doria, Rudi Vansnick, and Anne Aikman-Scalese as well as Avri Doria.

Sorry about that, Avri. I mentioned you twice. We have apologies Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Marika Konings, 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 Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you Terri. We'll move on to the statements of interest. If anyone has an amendment, an additional disclosure in relation to your statement of interest, could you please offer it now?

Okay, thank you very much. I see that Avri notes that she has to be on two calls at once, and all I can say is I feel your pain, Avri. So thank you for being on this one.

In the meeting that I missed and Rudi chaired - and I think it's great; Rudi thank you so much for doing that - there was sounded like a consensus that was developed among those on that call that SCI could advise council that the ten-day waiver rule I think should not really be addressed unless there was a crisis that arose on that issuing council because this is a type of issue that only came up on a theoretical basis and that in addition to that, that it was - as I understood it -- the SCI's opinion that as currently written the operating procedures do not permit the application of the ten-waiver rule to resubmitted motions.

Now do I have that correctly? Have I stated that correctly that as currently written, the operating procedures do not permit that? Amr I'll go ahead and recognize you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne. This is Amr. I didn't raise my hand, just putting up a check mark to indicate that I agree that that is accurate. At least I believe it is. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So currently you believe the operating procedures do not permit that and you believe that that is clear.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr again. I do believe that the operating procedures do not permit that. To me it's clear but the reason this came up I guess is because it might not have been as clear to others. If we need to clarify that, I don't mind explaining that and I thought that was kind of what we had previously suggested and I thought that was what Julie had suggested we communicate to Council just to make sure it is clear to everyone. But I may be wrong on that. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So if I could restate Amr - it's Anne again - your understanding of what we're going to do is write a letter saying that we believe ten-day waiver rule does not apply and that we believe that this does not need to be further clarified in the operating procedures.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr again. Yes I think a letter to Council right now could include the fact that we believe that the operating procedures do not allow motions to - resubmitted motions to benefit from the ten-day waiver rule.

And it was my understanding that we would also recommend that SCI - that the SCI's recommendation is that no further work can be done on this at this time until it becomes apparent that there is actually a need to amend the operating procedures to make allowances for this. I hope that was clear. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Avri may I ask for your comment on how we might put this out for consensus call? Is your agreement - do you have agreement with what Amr just said and how we would phrase that for a consensus call?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Yes I certainly agree with Amr. I think, you know, what you I guess or previous chairs have done on these consensus calls is - you know,

because we basically do a - I don't know whether we actually - sometimes we get an affirmative consensus where everybody had to say yes I agree. And other times there was just a time out that sort of said, you know, when on a certain amount of time, if there are no objections, you know, then it has consensus.

And we have no rules about - we have rules about full consensus but not about whether it's active or passive. You know, I think in the past (Ron) had used active consensus when something had been very controversial and perhaps allow the passive consensus when it hadn't. But I think that's pretty much your call as chair with, you know, the acceptance of those participating. But however you want to do it is fine.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Let me propose something and see if this is a good idea or a bad idea. We have this call and then we have another call scheduled in two weeks. What if we put it out for active consensus within the next two weeks and then if we get it, great, and if in our final call before Dublin we don't, we just put it out for like a 48-hour passive consensus? Is that a good or a bad idea? Rudi is agreeing with that idea.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr again. I'm sorry, Anne. I lost audio for a couple of seconds. Could you please repeat your suggestion? Thanks?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes Amr, I was suggesting that a bit of a compromise between the active and passive consensus notion would be to put this out for active consensus for the next two weeks. And if we don't get an active consensus - i.e. if we do not get a response from everyone on SCI - that then we would be in a position to put it out on a passive consensus after our next call to get essentially to preapprove that so that we would definitely have, you know, one form or another of consensus prior to Dublin.

But maybe that's not enough time to get our report in. Could staff comment on that? Julie, let's see, where are we time-wise? Maybe we have to have consensus by our next call in order to get our report to Council.

Julie Hedlund: Hi Anne, this is Julie. I'm sorry I couldn't put my hand up. I'm not in the Adobe Connect room, but I would think we could ask for consensus by our next call.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Okay. And which type of consensus are we...? Are we saying that we have to do passive consensus in order to make that work or - I'm looking at calendar here. Probably not because the SCI report itself does not have to be to Council ten days prior, does it?

Julie Hedlund: That's correct. It's just a report that's during - this is Julie again, sorry - it's just a report that will be given on the Saturday during the GNSO working session. Generally staff do ask for those reports be able to be posted at least a few days in advance. But it's not the ten-day rule that applies.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Well I think we could meet that using this hybrid approach of asking for active consensus in between now and the next call. And then if we don't get an active response from every participant -- which is always hard to do because we don't really get that much active participants in some quarters - we could then put out a passive response after that.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie again and I'm sorry not putting my hand up, but it seems to me that since we're not actually - the SCI is not actually making a recommendation for changes to the operating procedure but it's simply getting consensus on a letter to send to the Council, I think that we don't - as Avri noted, it's not - the full consensus rule does not apply. So I think we do have some leeway there to use passive if we need to.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Okay thanks Julie. I see Marika's suggestion now. I also see in the chat though that Rudi has said which type of consensus does the council expect? And of course I think Rudi definitely knows that, you know, we work

on full consensus. But Rudi is your question whether Council is looking for active or passive consensus?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Yes indeed. I think it's important that when we are making our report that we can put weight of the consensus we got from the group.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Okay. So it sounds as though because in this case we are not actually asking for a change to the operating procedures, I think that we can put this one out for passive consensus if anyone has an issue to raise at - prior to the next call which is two weeks from now.

And so I think we'll go with what we're, you know, calling passive consensus at this time and in particular in light of two factors, the first factor being we're not asking for a change to the operating procedures and the second factor being that we do have a somewhat low, you know, participation at this time and don't really know if we'll get, you know, responses from people.

But since it's the responsibility of each of the SOs and ACs to be active and respond with respect to SCI issues, the passive response format puts that obligation on them to, you know, raise an issue or hold your peace if you will.

So if staff could send maybe this particular letter around again and the letter that Julie has drafted. Could we focus just a moment on Julie's letter and determine if this is the letter that we want to send around for the consensus call? And...

Julie Hedlund: And actually this is Julie, sorry. It wasn't actually a letter that I drafted. I drafted a summary of the discussion that we had on the meeting on the 23rd. I certainly can draft and will draft a letter. Happy to send that around and then have everybody (unintelligible). I think it will say essentially what was in that summary but the summary was not in a letter form.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:       What I was thinking Julie is that we could kind of kill two birds with one stone here by looking just at your text that begins with the second sentence where it says, "After some discussion there was consensus of SCI members that the SCI should not recommend a change to the GNSO operating procedures at this time with respect to this issue. However they agree that the SCI should send a response..."

Oh wait, "They agreed that the GNSO operating procedures are clear that the waiver of ten-day deadline for submission motions does not apply to resubmitted motions. Although changes are not recommended at this time, SCI will revisit the issue if requested by counsel and specifically if there is a contentious issue that warrants it."

So in a kind of paraphrased way does that make sense to people as what we might send out as the consensus call? And if so, Julie can work on it the way that she just described. Okay I'm showing two agreements, three agreements.

Angie Graves:       Angie agrees.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:       Angie are you on the phone?

Angie Graves:       I am, yes. I just can't get to my screen at the moment. Apologies. I'm agreeing, thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:       Great, you are agreeing. Perfect. So Julie let's ask you to do that and we will set this out for a consensus call on a passive basis. And actually Julie I think you can probably just run the language that we were talking about for the consensus call by me and Rudi if everybody else is okay with that.

Julie Hedlund:       Will do. I'll take care of it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:       Okay. Anybody object to the consensus language just being run by chair and vice chair? No objections to that so we'll go ahead and we'll move on. I'm mindful of trying to get to the amendments to motions issue.

This is a very complicated issue. I have put out on the agenda for today is that I thought that we could address two threshold issues. And I think Terri we can now put up the other item that you had at the beginning of our call. And the threshold issues, I thought it would be a good idea to explore as a preliminary matter first of all the question whether an amendment should be characterized as friendly or unfriendly.

There's been a fair amount of discussion on the list about this particular issue. I wondered if anyone had any late breaking thoughts about whether it's useful in council to first as a sort of a decision tree matter - and I think this actually has been happening in council - to determine whether or not the amendment is quote/unquote "friendly" in nature.

How about if I ask for a straw poll? Who thinks it should be determined first whether it's friendly in nature? If you agree that amendments should in council be characterized as friendly in nature - and this is just an initial kind of straw poll. So I've got three people saying yeah let's determine whether or not it's friendly as an initial gate.

And I've got three people with no opinion. For those who agree that it should be determined, could you give me some thoughts on why you think it's useful to characterize it as friendly or not from the very beginning? Oh Amr. Go ahead Amr.

Amr Elsadr:               Thanks Anne. This is Amr. Yes I believe that it should be determined by the maker - the submitter of the motion - whether he or she feel that the suggested amendment is friendly or not. One thought I have on this is that an amendment may in fact really change the purpose of the motion and sort of the substantive issue that is being voted on by the council.

And one thing that may be problematic here is that we may actually end up with a completely different motion on the same topic, which I believe has happened in the past. And a separate, a different motion which would be a new motion I think should be subject to the rules of submission of a motion including the deadlines or perhaps the waiver to the deadlines.

So yes I would be in favor of some mechanism for the maker of the motion to agree that the amendment motion is indeed friendly or not. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:        Okay I see Amr. If I'm understanding that correctly -- let me just restate - the view is if it's characterized as friendly by the maker of the motion, your view is that you're not changing the motion that much and that it essentially remains materially the same motion.

But if the motion is characterized - if the amendment is characterized by the maker of the motion as unfriendly, your view is that you've likely changed the substance of the motion. You have likely changed it materially. Is that accurate?

Amr Elsadr:                Yes that is accurate. Thanks Anne. Just for the record I'm just thinking that this may be one among other issues. This is just the one that I have thought up. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:        Okay. Let me ask a follow-up question there and in particular I would like to pose this question to Avri since it arose in Buenos Aires regarding the seconder's opinion of whether a motion is friendly or unfriendly because I believe we did have a motion in Buenos Aires that arose where the motion maker characterized the amendment as friendly but Avri's point of view was that it was not friendly.

So I'd like to ask the whole group - and maybe Avri could comment first - about whether the seconder's opinion on the friendliness of the motion should

trigger a vote and has it always been that way in Council because I notice that Marika is talking about codifying the existing process.

And has it always been the case in Council for those who've participated on Council that the seconder's opinion of whether or not a motion is friendly will govern - will trigger a voting process if the seconder does not feel it's friendly? Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, thanks. Avri speaking. In terms of your first question - whether it has always been the case - probably not. I think it was several years ago that they started asking the seconder. I think at some point there was a realization there was a maker and a seconder. If we were going to continue this practice of friendly amendments, then, you know, the seconder should also be asked.

I don't think any seconder was so presumptuous as to say no after the maker of the motion had said yes until Buenos Aires. I think that that was the first instance, the first instance I remember of anyone doing that. But it certainly had been the case for a while before that, that the seconder was asked.

Now obviously it being the case that the seconder was asked, I felt it was totally appropriate for me to say yay or nay in that occasion. Do I believe that it is the right thing to do from a statutory basis comes down to I'm not even sure our whole friendly motion or friendly amendment motion really makes that much sense.

As I say it doesn't take into account that once you make a motion and second, the change control of it passes through the Council and does it really belong to the makers of the motion any more. But given that we do have the tradition and that we do want to keep the tradition, I think it's reasonable that both have to agree. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Okay thank you Avri. And that brings us to a set of questions in relation to characterizing the amendment as friendly or unfriendly.

The first is I note in Amr's comment in the chat is that the operating procedures he says do not in fact require a second to a motion and that that is simply a practice. Marika, can you go ahead and comment on that?

Marika Konings: Yes thanks Anne. I hope you can hear me okay. I just wanted to clarify as well that the request of the Council specifically asks SCI to either codify existing practice - and I think several people have already described how it currently works - or if the SCI doesn't agree with the practice, come forward with alternatives.

So it may make sense to first clearly document what the current practice is and then see indeed if there's support in SCI to codify that further or whether some changes are suggested to that.

On Amr's point that's absolutely correct. Indeed there's no mention or requirement in the operating procedure that a seconder is needed. It has been a standing practice though that a seconder is asked for and I think Avri noted already as well and as far as I recall I think seconders have always been asked if there was already in place whether amendments were considered friendly or not.

And I think in most instances - and I think you refer to the one instance actually where it didn't happen that way, but in most cases there seems to have been agreement most of the time between the maker of the motion and the seconder.

But as you noted on the meeting that we had in our last meeting there was indeed the instance where there wasn't agreement and then the practice was to take a vote on it as I think it's considered that where the seconder is in place both the maker of the motion and the seconder are considered the owners of the motion and folks will need to agree to any changes that are made.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great, thank you very much Marika. This makes me wonder - and I'll put this out to the members - whether we should try in between this call and our next call to set out in a few steps exactly what we believe the current practice is and possibly review that itself with Council in Dublin so that we know that we're all on the same page as to what all the counselors think the current practice is.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry. This is Julie. I'm sorry not to raise my hand. (Mary) actually - when we were framing this issue for the SCI - did a good deal of work on trying to describe the current practice. I'd certainly would be happy to bring that forward and also make sure that it's fully fleshed out, although I think she was quite thorough and I could send that out into the SCI.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: That's a great idea Julie. I think that would be very helpful. And I think there's only one other - and we can discuss that then substantively in our next call. And I thank you Marika for reminding us what the nature of the task is.

The only other topic I wanted to get to - and then maybe we can end this call early - is the topic of whether or not amendments trigger a need to vote on delaying the motion to the next council meeting. I just would like to get a little bit of history on that point.

And it may be part of codifying current practice. I personally do not know whether there have been cases of amendments triggering a delay in the vote. Amr, I'll recognize you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne. This is Amr again. Currently right now the operating procedures allow for any counselor to defer a motion to the later - the next GNSO Council meeting. I believe there may be some sort of just rules or guidelines on how that is handled the second time around.

But in terms of the first time, any counselor can actually defer (unintelligible) to a later meeting so there's no need for Council (unintelligible).

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I believe - just real quickly Amr. I'm sorry, but you mean in the discretion of the chair, right? Is that correct?

Amr Elsadr: No, no, it's just not the discretion of the chair. It's any counselor, any sitting counselor at the meeting can ask for a motion to be deferred to the next meeting. So if we sort of restate this and make it at the discretion of the chair then we're sort of taking that option away from other counselors and I would not recommend that.

I actually think that the ability of a counselor to defer a motion for one reason or another - especially if an amendment is being made that a counselor feels may not be friendly or the counselor feels he or she may need to get back to his or her stakeholder group or constituency to consult with them on it then I think that would be a pretty good solution to that. But yes that restricts deferral of motions to the GNSO Council chair or to a vote. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you. Avri?

Avri Doria: Hi. I pretty much agree with Amr. I just want to - this is Avri speaking - I just wanted to check one thing. The way the practice currently works as I understand it is if it's not accepted as friendly then there is an immediate vote on the amendment.

Now it's at that point - and that has been the case. And there have been a few cases over time where an amendment was voted on that wasn't accepted as friendly, not just the (BA) instance.

At that point I believe that Amr and Rudi are correct - Rudi in the chat - that indeed that is a sufficient mechanism for anyone to say, "Whoa this

amendment is too big. I got to take it back," you know. And so I don't think we need an extra mechanism there. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, great. So one thing that might be noted in connection with current practice is that because traditionally any counselor can delay a motion to the next meeting that there doesn't need to be another layer of a rule to make that happen. It will happen in due course based on existing practice if that counselor feels that he or she needs to discuss it further with his or her constituency.

Marika could I ask you - do you have any idea where I got the notion that when a counselor moves for a vote to be delayed on a motion that the chair must then make a final determination as to whether that will happen but that the chair has traditionally done that but that it is a matter that's within chair's discretion? And I'll recognize Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks Anne. I think you're correct there. And I think that was actually done on the recommendation of the SCI. We need to look back at the language because I think the SCI did provide an official communication on that topic to the Council.

But I think it was indeed along the following lines of that a council has discretion or the council chair had discretion to grant the delay and in most cases it was helpful if council members asking for a delay state their reasons. But I think it also says that no more than one deferral is granted.

And as I noted in the chat, that may be an issue that the SCI may need to factor in. What happens indeed, there is a motion. It's deferred once. More time is needed. Then at the second time it's considered during the meeting, you know, substantial changes are suggested.

Would there then be additional discretion for the chair to grant more time or would it then fall within that practice of only giving one deferral? I said it would

be maybe helpful to look back at the communication that the SCI provided because there's indeed basically is in the chair's discretion.

I think that may still give the chair then the room to say well this is maybe not - it's a first deferral of a new motion because changes have been made and as such they need sufficient consideration.

But of course hope - and that may be something as well that can be written in the rules that of course ideally amendments to motions are submitted with due time for the council to review and discuss both at the council level as well as at the stakeholder group level. So it doesn't need to be dealt with on the spot, which is always more complicated and may not allow for sufficient consultation with other members of the group.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Exactly. So I think probably the most productive thing at this point on this issue would be to have all of us as SCI members review (Mary)'s write-up - and this is really, really helpful - and to - maybe we could have that in the form of a Word document where it can be red-lined so that people could add items such as the one just discussed about the deferral in the event amendment is seen as material or any other comments people may have regarding the current practice.

Julie could that be sent out, you know, as a Word doc where people are asked to comment on codification of the current practice? Maybe Julie's at the airport. Maybe I'll ask Marika. Hello?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I can pass it on to Julie. So just to clarify, you would like the process Mary outlined in a Word document so people can review it and make comments and edits ahead of the next call. Correct?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: That's exactly it, and then we would discuss those comments and edits to (Mary)'s write-up in our next call as our primary agenda item. Does anybody - let's see, Rudi may I recognize you for your comments on that?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Well as I was just mentioning also in the chat, when we are ending up and having a second deferral I'm just wondering if that would in fact initiate a new (motion) at the end to avoid that second deferral. Maybe that's something we have to pick up in the note that (Mary) made. I think we need to take care of that possible situation.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Right, understood. And I notice that Amr's mentioning in chat the deferral of motions is actually not a tradition. And that was mischaracterized by me. It's actually in the operating procedures. I think the thing Amr that I was referring to as a tradition was that traditionally the chair does go ahead with the deferral and traditionally does not usually say, "No, I'm not deferring that motion."

But you're right to be more concise about it. But deferral is in the operating procedures, and I think Marika has clarified for us that the ultimate decision on the deferral is in the discretion of the chair but that generally speaking the chair has honored that request.

And with respect to Rudi's question about having a second deferral and with respect to other issues about the way things should be or certain contingencies, I do think that those need to be discussed but I like the fact that Marika has focused us in this conversation on first of all just codifying, you know, or documenting I guess, documenting what we believe the current practice to be.

So I think the best thing to do in terms of staying focused in between this call and the next is just to focus on coming to consensus of what we believe the current practice of council to be. And I see that Avri's - or excuse me that Amr is commenting. He doesn't remember about the discretion of the chair issue.

I think Marika correctly pointed out that SCI did at least discuss this in the past in terms of doing our own work. And I can't personally even remember

the context for that but perhaps staff could remind us of the context for the discretion of the chair as one of the other follow-up items to this meeting.

So just for me to recap the follow-up items, Julie will be sending to me and to Rudi the consensus call language for approval with respect to the first issue of not applying the ten-day waiver rule to resubmission of motions. And then once Rudi and I have reviewed and passed on that, Julie will send out for consensus call on a passive basis, giving a deadline I would say probably within one week of when it's sent out.

And then secondly if we could be reminded by staff of the language in relation to deferral of motions till the next meeting and the operation of the discretion of the chair in the operating procedures, that would be very helpful.

And then thirdly to send out (Mary)'s language in Word format where we can all make comments in redline as to whether we believe it codifies that current practice or if there are items that need to be added based on members' experience with what Council actually does.

So unless someone else has a comment on those three follow-up items, I'll proceed to our next agenda item. Go ahead Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne. This is Amr again. I'm not sure if I mentioned this before or not but the issue of sort of codifying the practices of friendly amendments sort of came up in the context of another discussion that was going on during the Buenos Aires meeting.

And because we did have the sort of mix-up with a friendly amendment being suggested for one of the motions I guess during the GNSO Council meeting in Buenos Aires, I just wanted to note that at the time there was at least one counsellor who voiced an opinion that he was not in favor of any sort of practice to codify how friendly amendments are done.

So I just wanted to suggest that if we do actually recommend as a committee to the GNSO Council that we do need to codify this practice that we take a very lightweight approach to doing it and only make changes to the traditional practices the council has been using just with very clear reasoning on why any changes need to be made. Just thought I'd mention that. Hopes that helpful. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalse: Okay thanks Amr. I think it might be helpful for us in our work to distinguish between codify and document. I believe that codify, an example would be, "Hey, there's nothing in the operating procedures that says that a motion is going to be seconded. Should that be codified in the operating procedures?" Which I think it's a very different question from, "Let's document what we're doing now."

So at this phase, I think that it would be helpful for us just to focus on documenting what we think the current practice is and having that be accurate and agreed so that we have an agreed starting point.

And I see that I'm getting some agreements from Amr on that. And he does mean that the use of the word codify would be talking about, you know, if we are going to recommend changes, that that would be changes to the operating procedure would be a matter of codifying.

And I see (Laurie) is typing. (Laurie) did you want to speak or you just want to type?

(Laurie): I can speak. Hi. My audio on my computer's not working so I had to dial in. It's weird. I was just thinking in terms of documenting process and to take Amr's point about the sensitivities, how - I guess I'm a little perplexed about how we would document something. That would - in a sense we'd be like taking an oral history.

And who would the rapporteurs be? Would we go to different counsellors, ask them what they think the process is? Do we go through prior minutes and grasp the processes some way? I'm just curious how we (unintelligible).

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sure (Laurie). I think that's a good question and I think that what I'm seeing that might be logical here is that we could potentially just use (Mary)'s summary that is displayed on the right hand side in Adobe Connect. And I don't know if you're in there but (Mary) had previously documented if you will a draft documentation of how the process works in Council.

We do have several counsellors on the SCI and so I was asking for everyone to give input on what (Mary)'s description of the process was. And then when we could come back together in the next call to determine if we believe that we have accurately documented the process then my proposal would be that we at least introduce that topic at Council before moving on because Marika very appropriately reminded us of the scope of the task, which was first to document the existing process.

If we can agree on what that existing process is, that could be reviewed with Council and we could, you know, in accordance with your suggestion of how do we figure that out, we could figure that out with Council in Dublin. Now in a 15-minute meeting we're not going to be able to review every aspect of that but we can kind of, you know, start the topic and ask Council for its feedback on whether we have accurately documented the existing process. Does that make sense?

So it would be three steps - first step being we all review (Mary)'s write-up, second step being we send in prior to our next meeting any edits we have in redline that need to be discussed. Then we do our call on the 8th of October and see whether we can reach an agreement on that this is the existing, you know, the current practice and that we let Council know at least that part of it.

Here's where we are. Here's our draft of what we think the current practice is. If you have any feedback, you know, please give us that before we continue prior work in the second step of the scope of our task. Does that make sense, (Laurie)?

(Laurie): Sorry, I was on mute. Yes it makes sense.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Okay. All right, well that actually feeds into Item Number 5 if I may move on to the planned report for Council in Dublin. It would be first of all, assuming that we have consensus on our letter to Council about the first issue, we would report that in Dublin along with the letter, which we could finalize in our next call.

And then the second aspect of what we would report to Council in Dublin would be a draft of what we believe the existing procedure is to document the existing procedure and to provide that to Council for any further input they may have before our work continues.

Anybody have any comments on the plan for the report? Okay I'm seeing at least one agreement check.

And then finally so we can try to stay on time I will ask for any other business, any other topics that anyone would like to raise.

Great well I really appreciate all of you coming to this call. I'm very aware of how much is going on and appreciate your time. And I'm happy that we're able to make some progress on this call.

And thank you staff as well for figuring out how to cover us for this call. And until next time, for those of you coming to LA, see you there for the accountability and for everyone else have a great couple weeks. We look forward to your active participation on the list. And again thank you again for

your time and your thoughts. And we'll call the meeting to adjournment.

Thanks everyone.

Avri Doria:       Bye, thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:       Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew:       Thank you. Once again this meeting has been adjourned.

END