

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Tuesday 08 October 2013 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the Tuesday 08 October 2013 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-sci-20131008-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group – Primary
Ronald Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Primary – Chair
Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP – Primary
Mikey O’Connor – ISPCP – Alternate
Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary – Vice-Chair
Amr Elsadr – NCUC - Alternate
Jennifer Wolfe – NCA - primary
Greg Shatan – IPC - Alternate

Apologies:

Nuno Garcia – NCUC – Alternate
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC - Primary
Marie Laure Lemineur – NPOC

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de Saint Géry
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: ...to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: On the recording now, perfect. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone, and welcome to the SCI Working Group meeting on Tuesday 8th of October, 2013.

On the call today we have James Bladel, Greg Shatan, Angie Graves, Ron Andruff, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Mikey O'Connor, Avri Doria, Amr Elsadr, Jennifer Wolfe.

We have no apologies so far as I have noted. I will check this right away. I'm sorry, we have as apologies, Marie Laure-Lemineur, Nuno Garcia. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcript purposes? Thank you very much and over to you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Julia. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon everyone and nice to see you all on the call. Thank you for making the time. We have a nice agenda today and then we have a meeting coming up in Buenos Aires shortly so I'm looking forward to actually getting a chance to see everyone and have an opportunity to get to know new members more closely.

So on the first item we have is the statements of interest and the question is if anyone has any changes to their SOIs in the last period that we should be aware of?

Hearing none we'll move on to Agenda Item Number 3, approval of the agenda. The agenda has been published on the wiki as well as sent out to all of us. We're looking at the resubmission of a motion on the screen right now. But does anyone have any issues with regard to the agenda? And if so please bring that to the floor now.

Hearing none thank you very much. I would just make a note: Mikey O'Connor has been gracious to advise Anne Aikman-Scalese has also sent her regrets for not being able to attend the meeting but Greg Shatan is filling in for her so I'm sure we'll hear from Greg.

And actually apropos we move on to the Item Number 4 which is resubmitting of a motion. And this is an item that has been particularly driven by IPC. And so I understand that (unintelligible) her notes to the list that there was a information submitted back to the IPC and that hopefully they have responded in some fashion. And perhaps I could look to Greg to fill us in a little bit on that hopefully with information. And be helpful for the committee. Please, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan. Yes, we were able to - Anne and I were able to have a - to discuss this matter with the IPC leadership and on the IPC general call. And we have feedback from the IPC.

And, you know, with regard to the language that I, you know, currently posted here the language that the IPC would like to suggest - and I'm sorry this was not sent around before the meeting but with Anne's travel schedule and the call being just before this that wasn't possible or at least it wasn't likely and it didn't happen.

The suggestion is that Number 3 should read, "Upon the second resubmission of a motion, i.e. the third time the same motion comes before the Council, require a seconder of the motion from each house as a prerequisite for placing the resubmitted motion on the consent agenda." So that is the first of two suggested language edits.

The other is that, "If material changes have been made to the text of a motion that motion will not be considered a resubmitted motion and whether or not a change in text is material would be determined by the GNSO chair - GNSO Council chair." That would be our suggestion on that point.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Greg. Is there some more that you'd like to add to that or can we start to dig into this one?

Greg Shatan: I guess I would say as a general matter, first, I know that I'm, you know, coming late to this issue though I've tried to read up on the, you know, on the listserves and the like so that I'm not completely just kind of cruising in here at the last moment so I've tried to educate myself to some extent.

The other thing I would note, you know, coming at the issue somewhat fresh I decided to take a look at how this is dealt with in Roberts Rules of Order which at least in the US would be the primary source for this sort of parliamentary procedure.

And I note that Robert's Rules of Order contemplates that motions can be freely renewed at subsequent meetings of the same body. As a general matter they cannot be renewed at the same meeting of that body. But there are - Robert's Rules of Order contemplates that there should not be impediments in front of resubmitting a motion that was not - that was voted on but not adopted by a body.

So I think that's - at least to my mind, you know, and I think the IPC generally supports the idea that there shouldn't be impediments but in the interest of trying to find a position where we can all have consensus, you know, is willing to agree to these points as expressed earlier by me. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thanks very much, Greg. Very, very helpful. I see Avri has her hand. But I'd like to ask one quick question before I turn to Avri. And you noted in your explanation on Point Number 3 that it would require a seconder of the motion on the third introduction.

So I'm a little bit confused insomuch as I understood we would have - so on this - a motion brought to the table it does not go forward because of some

confusion and that it's reintroduced. How did you see that as - where's the third introduction? If you could help me with that I...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Well basically - let's say we have a motion that is brought up and it's voted on and it's not adopted. And there's no mention here of the reason for the adoption, I mean, or lack of adoption. And while, you know, point number one mentions that there should be a reason; confusion, I guess, could be one of the reasons but that's not in any means exclusive.

The - so the first time that the motion was renewed it would be renewed without any special requirements with regard to a seconder from the opposite house. Only if it was renewed for a second time, in other words, the third time that the motion was being put in front of the body at that point it would require a seconder from the opposite house.

Ron Andruff: Very good. Thank you for that. Mikey has asked in the list if you would mind posting the language to the Chat. I think that would be very helpful for all of us. It's been an excellent contribution. Let me turn to the list; Avri and then James. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Avri speaking. I actually think this is a very good proposal. I think going back to Robert's Rules any time, you know, there's an open question or even though we don't have to take that as the way I think is always wise because those are always really well thought out and have lots of experience behind them.

I think that this is a, you know, a good proposal. I do agree that I think that things as in Robert's - if I understand correctly - shouldn't be brought up in the same meeting; it should always be a subsequent meeting and, you know, and such.

I don't know that we're limiting that. I don't think we necessarily need to do that. But so I, you know, other than wanting to see the language and see something I didn't see in the hearing I think it's a great proposal. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: And the language is now posted in the Chat.

Avri Doria: Oh cool.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Greg. And thank you, Avri. Very valuable comments. James, please.

James Bladel: Thank you. James Bladel for the transcript. And I also believe that this is a lot of progress in the right direction towards preventing what we might call motion spam and, you know, arresting that before that gets a chance to get rolling.

I did, however, have a question and I thought that perhaps it's just not right in front of my nose so I don't see it. But I thought that there was some boundary on the resubmission, some sort of timeframe after which a motion would also be considered not a resubmission but a new motion.

And I'm wondering if that is something that we also want to consider as part - not just material changes but if something is let's say a year old or two years old or five years old that, you know, that we no longer call it a resubmission. And I wonder if it's worthwhile to see if we could circle back and capture that or if we should just move on without it.

Ron Andruff: That's a good point, James. We've always viewed this, from my point of view in any case, as something that is an immediate action. Something comes up in this meeting it has to be represented at the next meeting and then there's some, you know, follow on action within two or three meetings from the first motion presentation.

So it would - that's not a bad idea to include that from my point of view. Others on the committee have some thoughts towards that? James, perhaps, would you think about - oh I see Greg's hand come up. Please, Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: I would say I would also agree with that that there's some point at which a motion kind of loses its, you know, a motion can be new again after a period of time; it would not be considered renewed or resubmitted.

Ron Andruff: So thank you, Greg. So I think that from my point, as I say, that feels right. Avri commented on and others that we're moving in the right direction on this. I wonder, Greg, could we look to you to add in to your most recent comment this idea of the time limit before it becomes a new motion? And if you could put that back to the list that would be very helpful.

And when we get to Buenos Aires we can look really closely at this with all of our members in attendance or as many as we can and see if we can nail this one down. I think that it's been an excellent exercise in thinking through all of the various options.

Mikey makes a note in the comment list in the Chat channel that the time limit is a separate bullet and I'm inclined to agree with that to make it very clear. So, Greg, is your hand still up or would you...

Greg Shatan: Yes, my hand is - it's a new hand.

Ron Andruff: Please, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: First I agree with Mikey that, you know, this should be a separate bullet point and I was wondering if there were any thoughts of the group as to how long a timeframe there should be before a motion is new again, you know, any particular number of meetings or the like.

I think the most conservative, by which I mean the most restrictive view I could possibly imagine is saying that it would be new in a subsequent session of the GNSO, you know, when new people are seated. But I think that's probably overkill. I would, you know, suggest perhaps six months as a reasonable number. I might suggest a shorter number as an unreasonable number but I'll suggest a reasonable number to be reasonable.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Greg. Avri, please, you want to respond to that?

Avri Doria: Yeah, before I heard Greg, I mean, I was going to offer a completely other side perspective on it that I think it should come up at successive meetings and skip no more than one possibly two meetings which means at that point you've ended up three months between it being voted down and not and because at that point I really see no issue with introducing a new motion.

The real problem that we're trying to meet and I think in all of this is a motion has been presented, it failed, and within the three weeks time to really structure a new motion to put it in time for the next meeting and all of that, yes, you're going to resubmit the same motion with possibly (unintelligible).

I think if you've not talked about it for three months that it has - in other words, if you're bringing it up at every meeting then I guess it stays alive. But if you've skipped two or three meetings I think at that point it gets rather stale and it should be, you know, reintroduced anew with new arguments and what have you.

So I would recommend, if we're going to put in a rule for this, that it be a rule in that no more than N meetings may have passed. You know, my first thought of N was one or two but, you know, I'm certainly not stuck with that as a notion. But two - N of two means that we've gone a quarter.

Greg Shatan: And I think that's actually a fair number. I'm happy with that.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Greg. Thank you, Avri. Avri speaks with authority insomuch as she's been the Chair of the Council so she really understands exactly what this means in terms of these things flowing over so thank you for that contribution, Avri. James, I see your hand is raised, please.

James Bladel: Yes, thank you. James speaking. And I just wanted to voice my support for Avri's idea that rather than this being tied to the calendar it should be a number of subsequent meetings.

For example, I think that, you know, it's possible the GNSO meetings might go on hiatus if there were some sort of a, you know, if ICANN Board or staff were on retreat or if there were, you know, based on the ICANN meeting schedule or holidays or what have you. So I think it's better to tie it to the number of consecutive meetings than the calendar.

I do want to perhaps - and, forgive me, Ron, if this is, you know, stepping into your kind of purview here a little bit. But I do really want to ask the group here what specific problem we are trying not just solve but actually prevent.

Because, you know, I think if we're trying to prevent, you know, the frequent reintroduction of a motion that continuously fails versus trying to ensure that the door is not closed on motions that have merits but are failing on technicalities and just giving one or two holdouts an opportunity to address their concerns.

I'm really trying to figure out what we're trying to do here with this change specifically because my concern is that if we're - we might generate pages and pages of language and really miss the mark on both counts.

So I'm just trying to make sure that we're not creating a mechanism that could either be abused by someone who maybe just wants to tie up Council business or would really just kind of be abused by another someone maybe wanting to slam the door on the possibility that a motion was defeated on a

technicality and therefore it can never, you know, see the light of day again. I just - I don't know where we're trying to go with this at this point. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: James, with your experience on the Council I can appreciate where you're coming from. But I...

James Bladel: I have zero experience on the Council, sir.

Ron Andruff: Oh, I'm sorry. For some reason I had assumed you'd been there. But I often see you on the Saturday meetings in the room so I guess I confused myself. But in any case in the interest of time we will move. But I think your question is very valid.

And I think that in, you know, this is something that - well, let me put it another way. What I'd like to do is I'd like to ask Greg if he could fashion some language along the lines that Avri has described and if he has agreed to and so forth that would be in keeping with where he is at, where the IPC is at with the other elements of this particular issue.

And if that can be brought to the list and we can then discuss more in depth what you've just requested: Why are we doing this? And I think in a very short response the reason we're doing this was that something occurred within Council and there was a gap that the SCI felt should be plugged with some - in some form.

And so we've really wrestled with this for quite some time. And I'm hoping that in Buenos Aires we can actually look, again, at the - what I hope will be the final language that was suggested by Greg and Anne. And then we can talk about does this language make sense for this particular issue? Or should we park this issue and just watch it for another year to see if it ever happens again because it was an anomaly when it did happen.

Greg, I see your hand is up. James, I'll give you both two minutes and then we'll move on. Please, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: I'll be - this is Greg. I'll be brief. I guess first is just, you know, in looking at this point one is not one that we've discussed today obviously. It seems to be somewhat set. But my question about this is it says to provide a reasoning - I would probably say to provide a reason rather than a full reasoning - to justify the resubmission of a motion.

I would want to clarify that, you know, any reason, you know, should be reasonable in that it's not going to be rejected by the chair or by the GNSO Council that somehow the reasoning is - or reason is insufficient. That seems to me to leave room for ambiguity and for, you know, the possible, you know, exercise of politics.

And as a general matter, you know, these kinds of parliamentary rules are designed to assist the transaction of business and not to impede the introduction of business before a body such as the GNSO Council. so I may suggest that we clarify that, you know, as long as a reason is given that that should be sufficient.

I assume, hopefully, that people are mature enough not to, you know, provide, you know, frivolous or absurd reasons. But, you know, I don't want to over-dress this. But I was concerned that this idea - that the reasoning could provide some sort of a nebulous gate that could be shut in the face of a motion.

And I think that the solution of having a seconder if it's coming up repeatedly is sufficient to keep kind of, you know, loser or dilatory motions from being repeatedly introduced. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Greg. James, last word.

James Bladel: Yes, not to belabor this I agree that probably we should just move on. I just wanted to point out that I do now remember that particular incident that was the source of this.

I didn't want to draw any parallels to that particular case just to state that we've thought about this so much and discussed it for so long that I think we've now gone well beyond, you know, any of that one particular anomaly and now moved into a number of hypothetical scenarios.

And I think that we should probably just make sure that we're not going too far down a rabbit hole. So that was all I wanted. I just didn't want to think that that - my memory of that particular anomaly was driving my earlier comments. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Well said, sir. Thank you very much for this very fruitful discussion. And I'm happy to see that we're getting this one much more honed down to something, as you've just said, James, that makes sense.

So moving on, ladies and gentlemen, we'll move on now to Agenda Item Number 5, SCI charter revision. This morning I took some time to read through the most recent draft. And I actually recirculated that again just kind of as a reminder to the members of the committee that we'd be discussing this today and with the hope that they might have a look at the current charter themselves and give some consideration to it.

I wonder if Julie - or Julia can bring it up on the screen for us in the Adobe Connect and replace the resubmitting a motion.

Julie Hedlund: Hi this is...

Ron Andruff: I'm sorry, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, this is Julie. I'm, unfortunately, not in the Adobe Connect room, I'm actually on a mobile. And I apologize for joining late. The charter is one of the documents in the Adobe Connect room. I don't know if one of the other staff could bring it up. I think it just says charter and I think it's the only one in there that says charter.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Just to let you know that I'm actually on a mobile too. Glen or Julia, could you do the Adobe room?

Ron Andruff: And Mikey O'Connor has offered if you make him a host he said he can grab it and push it out so if that's of help to you. For the - for Lars benefit and for Julia's benefit we're not getting - oh, Mikey's just been made a host so there you go. So, Mikey, show us your stuff. Thank you, sir. So thank you, Julie, for loading everything. And, Mikey, thank you very much for bringing that on the screen.

So as I was saying earlier I took some time and had a read-through and looked at the various elements. Obviously the one element in terms of the decision making we understand that that is with the GNSO Council and I'm sure there'll be more discussion about that on the list and in Buenos Aires.

But in the meantime looking at the rest of the document it seems to me we have a much improved and up to date charter than we had when we started this exercise. For those who were not part of the committee at that time we had a lot of language that referred back to working groups from the last GNSO review and implementation process.

And those committees now - most of them you'll see in the deleted side of the - this document. Those are no longer there. And we have something that's much more of a - a fresh and robust and it takes into account elections for the chair and the vice chair, which we also didn't have going in.

So I'd like to open the floor just to have a conversation about what people think is working and not working with this document. And then in Buenos Aires I'd really like to make this the focal point of our work there. So if I could open the floor now to members to give their thoughts and opinions on this document.

This is says post - post revisions as January 10 on the top but in fact it's really the 8th of October document insomuch as this is the most current one. So with that I'd like to open the floor for comments with regard to our charter. I don't want everyone to rush the microphone at once so.

I'm assuming the silence means that we've had a look at this time and we're feeling that it's a document that fits or we're looking at this as we've never seen it before. Avri, please, thank you for raising your hand. Your thoughts, Avri, are you stuck on mute?

Avri Doria: I was on mute, sorry. And I was actually on double mute...

Ron Andruff: There you go.

Avri Doria: ...and I kept turning one off but the other was still on. I'm very confused, my apologies. I took your advice and read it again over lunch. And I was pretty much in favor of approving the changes and moving on.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Avri. You and I are on the same page with that one.

Avri Doria: It happens occasionally.

Ron Andruff: Indeed. Thank you for taking my advice. It's very much appreciated. Mikey, I know that you are very serious about charters and you do a lot of work in ICANN. May I turn to you and oppose on you to give your thoughts?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Ron. This is Mikey. I'm basically exhausted on this one. And so I didn't read it. It's been a long time; it was a long trail. There was so much confusion that the issues that I was trying to raise I don't have the energy to re-raise them. So I will consider myself a participant through exhaustion.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Mikey. Appreciate your candor. Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Well since you asked whether anybody had read it as if they had never read it before the answer is yes because I never have read it before. And I did read it, you know, as a fresh document but also seeing the significant changes made to the prior draft.

And while I don't know, you know, what the roiling issues were solved or not solved in getting from Point A to Point B I would say that the current draft of the document looks like a modern and appropriate document that contemplates the current standing of the committee as kind of separate from being the spawn of various working groups or other committees as standing as kind of a committee for the use and the improvement of the GNSO Council's processes and procedures.

So, you know, not knowing if there's a - which side I should feel I am on, I'm on the side that this looks like a good document at this point.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Greg. That's exactly the side you should be on. There really are no sides on the SCI, that's the nice part about this committee that we have the time to really drill down and try to get it right. So we have a collegiality that is rare in the ICANN environment.

But having said that, thank you for your comments. Fresh eyes are very helpful on these particular things because as Mikey said, there's a certain amount of exhaustion. You've seen it so many times and sometimes you can't remember if in fact you're reading things into it that were in your mind or are actually typed on the page so thank you for that.

I would ask perhaps Wolf-Ulrich or Jennifer, Wolf, both longer-term members of the SCI, if you have any thoughts with regard to the charter itself? And sorry to put you on the spot but I know you've both been a party to this for some time and I'd welcome any comments. Jennifer, please.

Jennifer Wolfe: Hi, it's Jennifer Wolfe. Yes, happy to comment. I mean, I think that it really nicely frames where we are through the conversation and through interjecting Council's inputs in terms of the full consensus. And I think that's going to be reviewed. But I think right now it nicely frames the ongoing nature and the purpose of the committee without over-thinking it. So I think we should go forward as it's written.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Jennifer. And, Wolf, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, hi. Well, thanks, well I'm basically, well, I'm fine with the text right now. And I have just to add because we talked about in advance to the Council meeting on Thursday that we had a talk on yesterday - yes, with the Council leadership how we can proceed on Council with the question of full consensus (working as) and so on.

So that is going on forward. So staff is going to put together all the questions to provide for the Council on Thursday - no, not this Thursday, no it will be the next Council meeting then - a document putting all the aspects we have discussed already so far together for the Council to make them aware - the Council members - about that. And then this discussion is going to be triggered and going forward.

So there was a discussion about whether there is a time pressure, well, to find a solution about the working method before Buenos Aires since the SCI we have in mind, well, to close the charter discussion at that time at the end, let me say, to come up with a new charter.

However it might - it might be the case that in this question - with regard to this question of full consensus or not, well, how to work within the SCI the Council make take some more time. So let's finish, let me say, the discussion about the text right now as far as possible. And if there is some more time to be discussed on Council level about the consensus that is a separate issue to be discussed in future. Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And I see Amr is also supporting the current draft. Wolf, can I ask you a question? You said that - there's a meeting taking place shortly and then I'm wondering when the next meeting is because I'm - the thought that's going through my mind and if the members of the committee are in agreement if we could put this to a vote on the list suggesting that this particular text we're ready to submit and with regard to the paragraph on consensus if we can just have staff put in square brackets this information to be determined by GNSO Council.

And submit that then in advance of Buenos Aires so that the Council may have the opportunity to see what we're saying in terms of our charter and then maybe that might help stimulate the final elements of it. Does that make sense? Well, let me put it another way. When is the meeting? And does it make sense that we could get a vote online? Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well let me say the following. We shall have one more Council meeting before Buenos Aires. It's - I think the 30th or 31st of October. And that's the meeting where we - where the item is put to the agenda, the item of full consensus.

So it is expected, well, to - and we will have a slot in Buenos Aires with regards to the SCI discussion itself. And in the Council meeting we expect, well, to move if the SCI is ready so with the charter text and with the recommendation for the new charter text. But the Council could move that new charter with, let me say, maybe some brackets in the text regarding the consensus issue.

So you have to take into consideration, let me say, the deadlines for the motions of Buenos Aires and that's it.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. So, Avri, I see your hand raised, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, no I had a question and perhaps I was just not understanding well because I was having trouble hearing. The meeting on the 10th is the last meeting before Buenos Aires, correct? And I didn't see a motion on this in the 10th...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Yeah, go ahead, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, there shall be another meeting on - Glen, can you help me? It's end of October, isn't it?

Avri Doria: There's the 10th of October.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, end of October.

Avri Doria: End of October? Okay, I'm looking at the Webpage at the moment and I see the 10/10 and then I see 20/11. So if there is one again later in October it's not yet - okay, it's not yet on the Council meeting list as far as I can tell. I may be wrong. So that's where I was being confused because I didn't see it on this agenda and I thought the BA was the next agenda item because...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Maybe, Glen could clarify that point?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...let me look at the schedule also. That's right, you've got authorities on that can say better.

Ron Andruff: Yes, so this is Ron. Glen, could you perhaps respond either verbally or put it into the Chat if in fact there is a 31 - okay, Mikey is saying Glen may not be monitoring the call.

Avri Doria: Look at the first calendar see if it's in there.

Ron Andruff: Well...

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. There is a Council meeting on the 31st of October. I don't know why it's not on the calendar. I'll alert Glen to that.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I don't think she's on today's call.

Avri Doria: I actually hadn't looked at the calendar; I was looking at the Confluence list of meetings and motions. I am looking at the calendar now and indeed it is on the master GNSO calendar, my apologies. I was looking at the motions pages.

Ron Andruff: No problem, Avri. Thank you very much. And so my understanding then is that we have between now and the 31st to finalize or to have an agreement from the committee that we can send this as a draft to the GNSO Council and then they can take it up either on the 31st of October meeting or put it into the agenda for the Buenos Aires meeting.

But it would be very good if we, as the SCI, could complete this within about a week. And if no one is in strong agreement against that I would ask that Julie will send out a notice with a clean draft and in the box that - in the paragraph that talks about consensus that that will be in square brackets language that

says the GNSO Council will confirm this language. And we can then submit that to them.

Avri, is your hand up again or is that from the previous time?

Avri Doria: No, it's just being forgetful.

Ron Andruff: All right. So does anyone have any thoughts about what I've just said, a disagreement or would like to stand on it, please. All right, hearing none then, Julie, if you can take that as an action item and we'll send that out to all the members of the committee so we can respond quickly. And I'll chase up anyone who are a little lazy in that regard and we'll make sure that we get this to Wolf and the GNSO Council post haste.

Today is the 8th; if we can look to a date of the 15th that would then be two weeks before the Council meeting. At least that would give them some heads up so that's what we'll target. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

Let's move on now to the working group self assessment. And Mikey and his working group were working on this and a number of people had responded. And then there was the question of whether they responded to a questionnaire about the actual assessment itself. And I think we got a little stuck there. So perhaps I can turn to you, Mikey, and get a sense of where that is at at this point?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I was not on mute the whole time. I hope I didn't make embarrassing noises. This is Mikey. The sequence of events was that we sent out a copy of the questionnaire to the working group. And but several - I don't know, a handful, six or eight people, filled it in but only one person actually went off to make comments about the questionnaire process itself.

And Ken was looking for a bit more feedback on that and asked that I circle back to the group and have them do that. And at the time when I launched it

we were sort of in a quiet period not really working too hard; we were sort of making incremental changes to a draft of a report and so it was a convenient time to do sort of a side project that didn't directly involve the working group.

Well, then we got busy. And so I have not gone back to the group because I don't want to put side projects on to a group that's working really hard on its main job right now. And I have to wait until we get done before I can give them extra jobs again.

So I don't really have a firm estimate as to when that will happen. I think we're making good progress but with consensus decision making one doesn't try to predict when things will get done. So that's sort of where things are at. Does that do it for you, Ron?

Ron Andruff: Yeah, Mikey, that's excellent. And I've been party to the dialogue between you and Ken as well so I'm more up to speed on that. And I certainly appreciate what you're saying is that we've got volunteers who are - got their day jobs, they're working diligently on something right now. You don't want to add yet another element.

Amr, please take the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. As someone who's filled out the questionnaire but not provided the feedback, following our last meeting - our last call on the SCI I attempted to go and fill them out. So when the time comes on the working group that this be brought up again I was wondering if it would be possible to sort of go over the actual questionnaire again?

Because I found it a bit difficult to provide feedback at a later date so I think it would be more helpful if folks who already filled out the questionnaire could kind of go over it again? Would we fill it out a second time for providing the feedback? I don't know if that's possible or not but it would be helpful.

Thanks.

Ron Andruff: Thanks, Amr.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me jump in on that. I agree. And let me take an action to write Ken a note with any thoughts like that, you know, not just yours, Amr, but for sure that one because it's true, if you filled out a questionnaire a month and a half ago and now you're trying to do feedback that's tough.

And there's got to be a way to put a PDF of the questionnaire somewhere so that you can either review the questionnaire or you can review your own answers. And I'll see if Ken can give us a way to do that.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Mikey. And Julie had mentioned there was another working group - and I'm sorry, Julie, I don't have that working group at the tip of fingers, perhaps you can help me. There was another working group that was either just finishing or another potential test bed, if you will. Could you expand a little bit on that if there - if I've got this right?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. I actually, Ron, I don't recall what that group was. I'd have to look back I think many meetings to see what that one was. So I'll have to check on that for you.

Ron Andruff: That would be helpful, Julie. And I tell you why, if in fact we have to - or we don't have to but I think what's happened is Mikey had a group of some 20-odd members about, you know, 40% filled out a form which is quite exceptional, quite frankly, busy people.

And we've got some data back insomuch as how the working group worked but we didn't get how the actual assessment itself worked. So I'm wondering if we might just go out and approach this other working group in the same manner we did with Mikey. In fact we can go back and look at the document that Mikey submitted to his group. It was, I think, very well written.

Here's some information the SCI needs, it would be very helpful if you could help us with that. And if members agreed we would send this out to that working group and have them and specifically we'll put a - in bold large text right up front that we need to get the assessment of the assessment, that's the most important part, and see if we can get that.

Because at this point we're kind of - we've got a very good self assessment that we appreciate but we need to now know how respondents feel about it. And we need to put that to the market. So if we can - if we can do that that would be helpful.

So if you wouldn't mind just bringing that name back to - that working group back to the list, Julie, or perhaps send it to me and Ken and we can perhaps submit that document to them that would be helpful.

So with that then we'll move on to the next item on the agenda. That's the new work items from the GNSO Council. And this is voting by email and the possible inclusion of a waiver exception in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

So I had asked staff if they would perhaps tell us how many votes were actually taking place to give us some kind of a benchmark what the voting by email was looking like and how many votes were taken throughout the year so that we would then get a sense of what that means.

And I wonder if there's anyone from staff that might be able to respond at this point?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Ron. This is Julie Hedlund. Unfortunately we have not had a chance to do that. And that is on our list of action items.

Ron Andruff: All right. Thank you, Julie. One thing that I noted when I was reviewing the charter we actually asked I think four, maybe even five specific questions that when someone submits a request to the SCI to address some issue that

they're feeling isn't working in practice as it was developed in theory, that there's some specific information that we receive right from the get-go.

So Wolf-Ulrich, if you're still on the call, I see you still in the participant list, I'm wondering if it might be possible for you or whomever had submitted that to the SCI to go back and submit this issue of voting by email in the format that the charter actually describes so that the members have more background.

I think one of the problems we have - or I certainly have with this particular issue is I just don't have enough detail as to what, why, wherefore, how come and so forth so I can actually start to think about it. And I think that's one of the reasons we haven't been able to sink our teeth into this particular topic. So if that's possible, Wolf-Ulrich, to do that would be very helpful for us. May I ask you to respond to that or perhaps shed some light on this particular issue?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, well, it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So I'm - yes, you got me here because I'm also just thinking what was the reason, where did it come from, what time we - it was brought up and to what reason it came up. So I have really to think about from the Council's point of view and to put that question again there and to put together some ideas about that so that we have a more background on that. I'll do that, yes.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, sir. Much appreciated. We're at a point then where we've actually covered all of the seven items of the agenda and the next one is any other business. So I'm wondering if there's any other information or thoughts people would like to bring to the conversation? If so now is the moment.

Avri Doria: I move we adjourn.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey and Julie both have their hands up.

Avri Doria: Oh okay then I can't.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, you can't yet, sorry.

Avri Doria: Bummer.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, I'll defer to Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I just had a question down in the Chat that I wanted to pull up and that is given Wolf's situation and also I may want to submit one from the Thick Whois Working Group, where is this here form that we're talking about in our charter? And could that be made more visible so that...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: In fact, Mikey, it's not - it's not a form per se but if you, seeing as how you have your hands on the keyboard, if you can bring up the charter again to the share window? There is about two-thirds of the way down on the first page there's a list of how the questions should be submitted.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah and I guess the point is that, you know, that's fine for...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: That's fine for people who want to drive all the way through our charter but if we actually are asking for information in a format then it would be good for us to publish that format so that people know how to do it.

Ron Andruff: I agree with that absolutely and I see Avri has a checkmark on the box. I think we all agree. And that's the beauty of these five questions is they really at least put some framework around it so that will be very helpful. So for anybody who's on Adobe you can see almost at the bottom of this page, you'll see one, two, three, four five, those are the questions that I was speaking to specifically.

Julie, please, go ahead, your hand is up.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. I just wanted to raise a question that I also raised on the list yesterday. For some of the new action items that we have coming up, the voting by email and the possible inclusion of the waiver or exception to the Council's rules, and any other issue that the SCI considers, staff have been discussing whether or not it might be useful to have - to have someone volunteer on the SCI to sort of be a leader of a particular issue.

As we move forward with them in a way as we did I think it was J. Scott was sort of the leader of a small sub team when we developed changes to the SCI charter just as a possible suggestion. And then also staff would be able to help in that effort as we've done in the past by providing some background information on a particular, you know, on that particular issue, you know, and current status and then track the status and so on just to help the SCI with its work.

And then also staff were wondering whether or not the SCI would want to go to a more frequent meeting schedule. Right now we're at one meeting a month but it seems like sometimes some time has to be spent catching people up on that has happened, you know, since the last meeting when meetings happen only a month apart - you know, happen a month apart then there might be some time that's needed for catch up.

So I don't know whether or not the SCI would consider going back to perhaps a biweekly schedule. These were just some things that Marika in particular

had brought up and we have been discussing and I thought I would bring them to you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Julie. In fact that's - I wanted to bring this discussion up with the SCI members at our meeting in Buenos Aires. And perhaps I'll take advantage of this last few minutes then to talk a little bit about that.

As most of you should have seen there were some exchanges back and forth with regard to having a meeting in Buenos Aires and the time and date. The final time and, correct me if I'm wrong on this, Julie, but the final time as I understand it now is - we're going to meet at 4:30 to 6:00 in Buenos Aires we have a meeting and space available for us.

And then that will be after the GNSO Council GAC meeting or roughly the GNSO Council GAC meeting may go a little longer, one never knows. But effectively we tried to allow for anyone who's in Buenos Aires early to be able to capitalize and go to that GAC GNSO Council working meeting.

And then our meeting will take place - we'll have 90 minutes. And in that 90 minutes I wanted to talk through what our future looks like for the coming year and how we would achieve the workload and the things that we need to do.

And I think many of us on the call today are in agreement with Julie that sometimes so much time passes we forgot what's actually happened on certain issues and so forth. And that was one of the reasons maybe staff wants to move the idea along that we might meet more often.

But this is a conversation I'd like to have amongst all of us on our face to face. And so I just wanted to highlight again that the Buenos Aires meeting will be on the Sunday - the day before the opening of the meeting. I don't have that date - let me look - I guess I do. That will be the 17th of November from 4:30 to 6:00.

And that would give us an opportunity to spend a little time with each other and talk more about the items that we have on our agenda and how we want to proceed for the coming year.

So that is what I wanted to add. I'm wondering is there any other comments from any other members? I see Mikey's hand is up. This is the last few minutes of our call so please, anyone, who has some thoughts bring them forward. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that there's a slot for constituency meetings that's right on top of that meeting time. And so for any of us who are active in constituencies I think we're not going to be here. So I see that Julie is saying maybe we can try and move the time. But I think the time that you've described at least so far - at least I won't be able to make it.

Ron Andruff: Okay so I'm seeing also Greg - thank you very much, Mikey. I mean, we're all in the same boat insomuch as we all come from various constituencies. Greg says the understanding on the IPC was the 4:30 to 6:00 time was constituency meetings is not supposed to be encroached. I was not aware that that was the constituency time. I've been consulting with staff on that.

Julie, I welcome your comments.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. I was going to put a comment in the chat. What happened was that staff had a cutoff of last week the 1st of October that we had to put in a time for the SCI meeting; we had to select a time. And I suggested last Monday that the time of 4:30 to 6:00 could be a slot that could be changed but we had to make a request for this meeting or we would not get a meeting at all.

So I suggested a time on the list. I did not know at that time that the constituency meetings were set for then. I'm not even sure that that has been set in stone yet. But we can move the time of this meeting.

However, if we move it for earlier on Sunday it will conflict with other GNSO meetings. And if we move it to say very early on Monday morning or Tuesday morning or Wednesday it will conflict with other GNSO meetings.

So there will have to be, unfortunately, a tradeoff. I'm certainly more than happy to work to another time, I just need to understand what that time should be.

Ron Andruff: Yes, Julie, yeah, it would have been helpful to know that the constituency meetings were scheduled at the same time but we certainly appreciate the pressures of getting all these meetings and rooms and so forth. I'm going to come to you in a second, Wolf. I just wanted, Julie, so if we did the meeting from 6:00 to 7:30 on Sunday is there any conflict there that you're aware of?

Julie Hedlund: Well yes I think there would be conflicts. I'd have to look at them now. But I think that there are various other events that come up that evening as well. But I will coordinate with Glen and the staff and I see that, yes, also Wolf-Ulrich Knochen is working on this as well so I'll defer to him at this point.

Ron Andruff: Wolf, please, you have the floor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks, Ron. Yes, I'm in charge for preparing the GNSO agenda so I was aware that and I was thinking about and we had discussion last wrap up session with the Council how to organize stakeholder groups constituency meetings on Sunday. There was a general wish to have a separate closed stakeholder group or constituency meetings that day.

So that's - it's how it is, you know. I'm really - if I look to the draft schedule right now there is no other opportunity, well, to shift those stakeholder group meetings to other times so that's the case. So the Council meeting shall - the GNSO meeting - so official GNSO meeting on Sunday will finish at 4:00 and there's a break and there is one - there are two meetings.

One is the Board GAC meeting after that which is also of interest to some of the people. And there is the so-called the closed SG meetings. Let me just add one point so I remember very early times of the SCI when we started also to coordinate meetings in the annual meetings.

And we started then - we came back and we started Saturday morning early morning at 7:30 or so with that because that was just before the Council or the whole GNSO started. So I wouldn't like to ask for that but just as a reminder what we did in the past.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Wolf. That's helpful. And, Wolf, can I ask - can I impose upon you to work with Julie to see if you can come forward with one date and perhaps two that we can put to the list and have members confirm which one they would like to attend?

I was pushing to have the meeting as late on the day before the opening of ICANN Buenos Aires simply to allow as many people to fly in to join that meeting. But clearly we need to get that meeting scheduled. And so seeing as how you're a scheduler and Julie is as well, if you could, together, put some ideas to the list that would be very helpful and we'll nail one down very quickly.

So with that, ladies and gentlemen we're now three minutes past the hour. And I guess we will now bring this meeting to a close. And I would thank everyone very much for your contributions. It's been an excellent to hear all of these points of view. I think we've moved the ball a little further down the field. So thank you very much for that and look forward to seeing you in Buenos Aires. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Ron.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Thanks.

END