

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Tuesday 20 January 2015 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the Tuesday 20 January 2015 at 20:00 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-20jan15-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Ronald Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Primary
Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate
Greg Shatan – Intellectual Property Constituency(IPC) - Alternate
Anne Aikman Scalese – Intellectual Property Constituency(IPC) – Primary- Chair
Amr Elsadr – Non-Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) - Primary
Stefania Milan – Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) - Alternate
Lori Schulman – Not-for-Profit Organizations Constituency - NPOC Constituency- Primary- Vice Chair

Apologies:

none

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Glen de Saint Gery
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the SCI Call on the 20 of January of 2015. On the call today we have Anne Aikman-Scalese, Stefania Milan, Ron Andruff, Lori Schulman ,Greg Shatan, Amr Elsadr and Angie Graves. I show no apologizes for today's conference. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, Glen DeSaintgery, 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: Great. Thanks Terri and my first question is about any SOI updates. If anyone has an update to your statement of interest, could you please go ahead and speak up now? I'm hearing none. Well, I wanted to do a little ice breaker folks and have each person maybe make a comment about what their involvement with SCI has been and what their interest is in being involved with SCI. Obviously there's so many opportunities within ICANN to participate and I'd like for each person to say why SCI, why is this your choice? I guess I'll go ahead and start myself just to give a flavor of it.

I ended up coming onto SCI because when J. Scott Evans was the president of IPC, he asked for a volunteer to be alternate for SCI and it was a point in time where I had a couple of years of experience and I thought I'd like to get more experience and do so underneath someone who had already quite a bit of experience and so that's how I first became involved with SCI by being appointed the alternate but then what happened was that I realized two things about working with SCI. One was that I very much liked the neutral procedural approach within SCI that is relatively nonpartisan and the focus on process improvement and in addition I really appreciate the full consensus procedure that we use within SCI. I think it's a very valuable tool. So anybody else want to jump into the fray and let us know why you're interested in SCI?

(Lori Scholman): Hi. It's (Lori).

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Go ahead (Lori).

(Lori Scholman): I'm actually - you know I'm vice chair now. I'm a relatively new member. I joined last summer I believe. I think it was in July and again, like you, I was asked by a more seasoned person if I would sit as an alternate on this group and for me personally it seemed ideal because I could put my drafting - I'm a

lawyer by profession and what we're discussing is procedure and the drafting of procedure in a concise understandable way is always a good challenge, a good professional challenge. So personally I thought that would be a good fit and professionally in terms of contributing to the overall improvement of ICANN practices and procedures, I couldn't think of a better way quite frankly given how much emphasis is on the GNSO and how much we're under scrutiny right now to make sure that processes and procedures are done correctly and transparently and openly.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Well, thank you (Lori). Anybody else want to jump in or should I call on people and make it super orderly? Maybe I'll do it according to - good. Greg's got his hand up.

Greg Shatan: Hi Anne. Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I became involved in SCI a year or two ago. Time flies when you're having fun and like (Lori) and Anne, my background is that of a lawyer and I felt that SCI was a place where my skills and background could be put to good use. I've also been somewhat of a GNSO counsel work following the business of the counsel fairly regularly and seeing how for better or worse procedure or lack of procedure sometimes gets in the way of the business of the counsel or worse yet, can be used to game or play games with the business of the counsel.

I have a strong interest in procedure. I still have a well-thumbed version of (Robert's) rules of order from when I was in the Young Democrats Club in New York back in 1972. Thankfully we do not have the same rigorous parliamentary obsession that that organization did. Nonetheless, there are good reasons for order in my view or procedural order is that it works best when the procedures stay out of the way of the business and don't impede the business but provide smooth and well understood processes by which the business of the counsel can go forward.

So I've been quite active especially in the last year at drafting some of the pieces that went sometimes not quite as perfectly in retrospect as I would like

but that went up and became adopted pieces of the procedures. So I'm looking forward to continuing to do so. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thank you Greg. Amr, would you want to go ahead? I see your hand is up.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Anne. This is Amr. I would say I very much agree and identify a lot with what Greg has just said. For me, one of the reasons I found ICANN -- this was back in 2009 -- to be very appealing is just because of the nature of open transparent processes that lead to policy that is developed from the bottom up and considering where I come from, we're not really big on open transparent processes and governance and policy development. So it was all very refreshing.

So one of the things that ICANN and the GNSO that I generally was attracted to was the processes, their nuances and that sort of thing and so when I found out there was a committee that actually works on reviewing and improving these processes I was quite excited I guess to join in and I hope that that enthusiasm has shown in the work that I've done over the past two years. I think I joined this committee in March two years ago or March 2013 I think. That's about it. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thank you Amr. Let's see. Should I call on Angie? Angie, are you there?

Angie Graves: Angie is ready. Yes. It's perfect timing. I was just getting out of a loud place. Hi, this is Angie Graves. I have been involved for about two years as an alternate and I guess I can say on this call today that I am as of today taking the primary seat upon one stepping down. So my history is a lot of process development and procedural development for corporate governance of some large corporations and I'm very interested in multi stakeholders. So I like to - I very much appreciate this environment and as others have mentioned, the nonpartisan way in which we operate. It's a great group to be in and it really

gives me another aspect of ICANN aside from my normal constituency role and I'm glad to be here. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thanks Angie. Then I'm going to skip over Ron and let him go last and is it (Stefania)? Is that correct pronunciation? Are you there? (Stefania)? (Stephanie)? Hello? Terri or Julie, do we know if we have audio with (Stefania)?

Terri Agnew: (Stefania), your audio is not active at this time. To activate your...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: She's typing. Let's see here.

Terri Agnew: ...line, press the telephone icon on the top of the toolbar and follow the prompts or private chat me. This is Terri Agnew and we can dial out to as well (Stefania).

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Why don't you guys maybe - she hasn't given a number for you to dial out but we'll go ahead and move to Ron then if we don't have the audio established with (Stefania). Ron, could you give us a few comments?

Ron Andruff: Absolutely. Good afternoon everyone. Yes. So Ron Andruff from the BC. I've been very happy serving as a member of the SCI for two years and then I've been the chair for the last couple of years and it's been a real pleasure. All of your comments are very well received and so much as I update the (unintelligible) that we've all brought to this group. It is an interesting group. It's like peeling the layers of an onion. So there's always another one underneath and just the good company that we're in. These last couple of years, we've managed to check off a lot of - well, rather than say check off, what we've done is we've managed to knock some roughages off of some square pegs to fit in the round holes. So it's been very effective and I'm really enjoying it and that is probably one of my greatest pleasures at ICANN.

I'm stepping down now because I'm term limited but I'll also be stepping off the SCI because I have other commitments I have to deal with. I just want to say what a pleasure it's been working with all of you over these last years and I have every confidence that Anne and (Lori) will continue to lead this body equally efficiently if not better. Thank you very much.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thank you so much Ron and really I very much appreciate your example and leadership that you've set for the last two years. It gives us all a bit of a guideline as to what we can accomplish and do so with comradery and consensus. It provides really a great chart for working and I was curious to ask you Ron if BC then will be appointing a different alternate member in the future?

Ron Andruff: Yes indeed. That's the next activity. By the time you have your next meeting we should have an alternate to support Angie in the primary role.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Very good. Thanks so much Ron. We really appreciate your leadership these last couple of years and then do we have (Stefania) yet via audio? Are you there?

(Stefania Ymalone): Yes. I'm here. Can you hear me now?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Super.

(Stefania Ymalone): Hello?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Go ahead. Yes. Can you go ahead and talk about your interest in SCI please?

(Stefania Ymalone): Yes. Well, first of all, hello to everybody. I know some of you through other committees but this is not my first call. I joined the committee last year (unintelligible) for the (SEC), invited (Diabli), was (allowed) in the place but in fact, for a number of reasons I couldn't get my act together and actually

participate in the call. It is actually my New Year proposition to be more active and progressively help Avri more and more. I'm also new to ICANN. Well, actually, I joined ICANN first as a GAK member for my country Italy. It was a temporary appointment because I was temporarily collaborating with the government and actually on academic. So that was in the Toronto meeting in the fall of 2012 and soon then moved to (SEC) and been active there since but as I said, I'm still learning.

The reason why I'm interested in SCI is - well, I'm very much (unintelligible) but I also have a lot to learn. I think it's a good way of being forced to (unintelligible) myself with (unintelligible) and also contribute. So be patient with me. I'm going to be rather quiet especially in the beginning because I'm still learning. I'm taking a lot of notes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Great. Well, thank you so much and it's really, I think, very helpful, again, to have people in SCI who do have some government background as well. So welcome. Now, I know that Avri has the role of liaison to the counsel and also, at least in my current records, she's still the primary for the NCSG. Is she expecting that to change or is that going to remain the same?

(Stefania Ymalone): I think I cannot speak for Avri but I know she tried to get me to become more active because I guess she wants to dedicate herself also to other groups broadly but I think she's still - I mean, she's definitely still here but you should ask her for clarification perhaps.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Great. I'm just trying to confirm because I know that we are planning and I think she was agreeing with us that she would be the one to present our letter to counsel in Singapore but we'll move on now too unless anybody else has any comments and Greg your hand is up. Do you have a comment or is that an old hand?

Greg Shatan: That's a very old hand.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Thank you. Let's move on then to Item Number 3 which I wanted to review with our group the discussion of immediate review and periodic review as both those elements are contained in the SCI Charter and looking back at the charter and trying to figure out our work plan for 2015, I noted that there are problems that (Janice) of counsel refers to us that are of an immediate nature and they say, can you guys take a look at this and try to solve this and get back to us and then there's this second category called -- I refer to it in shorthand -- as period review and so I think Julie has now posted our working method. I'd like for everybody to just take a quick look at that so that we can have a good understanding about the difference between immediate review and periodic review. So I'll give everybody a second to read what's on the screen.

Is there anybody who's just on the phone? I guess not based on what we heard. So in terms of - does anybody need more time or are we okay and good to go? If you need more time, please raise your hand. All right. Seeing none. The letter that we proposed to send to counsel is going to be asking them for direction for a work plan for 2015 but in addition and our charter does include the responsibility for periodic review of recommendations that have been implemented at this point in time and we've referred to them in some of our meetings last year about things that we want to study and work on in the future under this periodic review responsibility.

It's certainly not my proposal that we try to come up with something to send to GNSO in this regard, its counsel, in this regard today but we will potentially be working on that in other calls this year. Most likely after Singapore and so I just wanted people to start thinking about some of the periodic review type issues and the review plan that is going to be proposed to the counsel ultimately and to just be aware that this is a responsibility that SCI does have. Does anybody have any questions about this working method before we move onto review of the draft letter? Mary Wong raised her hand but so did Angie. Go ahead Mary. Let's hear from you on that.

Mary Wong: I'm happy to seat to Angie as a member of the SCI and I'll go after her.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Angie, you could go ahead and comment please.

Angie Graves: Thank you, yes and thank you Mary. This is Angie Graves and I wonder if we have a record, a history, by date of implementation and by what was implemented of the work of this group over the past X period of time and if we don't schedule periodic review upon implementation, maybe that's something that we can consider so that it's really not a question what's up for review in any given year. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks Angie. I think that what we're talking about is reviewing improvements that have been implemented within the GNSO and their not specifically - it's not the work of SCI in particular but it's within the GNSO but I think Mary will probably be able to clarify that for us and also to potentially provide us with some of the items that might be on that list for our next meeting. So I'll go ahead and recognize Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Anne and thanks Angie. As you see from what Julie has posted in the chat, there is a page on the groups wiki space that summarizes the work that the SCI has done for the last few years and I want to thank Julie for putting that list together. I'll let everyone know that it wasn't actually as easy as one initially might think to find all the records. So it's there now and you can look at it to get a record of what the SCI has done. More broadly speaking and going back to both the working method and this may also be something relevant for the discussion of the letter, the SCI's charter -- the language of which we see here -- was approved by the GNSO counsel and I think it was October 2013 which was before the kickoff of the current series or iteration of the GNSO review, number one and number two, the history of the genesis of the SCI and in this respect Ron and Julie and others may have better recollection than I did.

This was born out of the last GNSO improvements where we saw massive changes to the way working groups operate and drafting teams and to the GNSO procedures including the working group guidelines. So it was felt at that point when the SCI was created and this carried over into the current SCI that in addition to periodic requests that might come from the GNSO counsel and other recognized groups, given the scale of the last improvements, it would be helpful to also give the SCI the ability to proactively identify issues that it could then raise to the counsel as meriting a review or some work whether by it or by someone else in that view. So hopefully that's helpful in terms of explaining where these methodologies came from and also in helping the group consider your next steps given the ongoing GNSO review. Thanks Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalase: Thank you very much Mary and I think maybe the important point about that that I want to make sure we're clear on for the whole group is that the periodic review is not a period review of the SCI's work itself but it is intended to be a review of the improvements that were implemented by GNSO counsel and then, I guess, the board when it would act on those recommendations. I know that at one point there was a reference to complete review of the new PDP manual as implemented but the thought was we don't quite have enough experience in that yet and then I think Mary is also pointing out the sensitivity in terms of timing that our review should be consistent with the work that GNSO counsel would want us to do after reading the GNSO review and the Westlake Report and this is why I wanted to make certain that this group, SCI, has the Westlake Report as soon as possible because it's work that needs to ultimately be coordinated.

That doesn't mean that we cannot take up subjects but the usefulness of our work will, I'm sure, require us to be aware of the results of the GNSO review and to be knowledgeable with respect to that review. So I think at this point, unless anyone else has further comments, we could potentially move onto the next agenda item. Is there anyone who would like to comment further on

this and if so, please raise your hand? I see Amr. Amr, can you go ahead please?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne. This is Amr. I put my comments in chat but I figured I would just go ahead and say it out as well. My personal interpretation of the issue of periodic review of recommendations in the SCI Charter and I may be mistaken about this is that this was a mandate given to the SCI to perform its own review of the GNSO operating procedures and not solely rely on the GNSO counsel to give projects to the SCI where the counsel feels that changes need to be made in the operating procedures. So I may be mistaken. My interpretation of the periodic review may be missing some other elements but that's what I've always thought of periodic review of recommendations in our charter meant. I never, certainly never, thought that it meant a review of the work the SCI has done in the past but like I said, I may be mistaken. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thanks Amr. No. I think that that's absolutely correct and I guess I feel that if it were not, Ron would be raising his hand and letting us know. I think it's right that SCI is chartered to undertake periodic review and I really appreciate the staff in terms of this working method, posting the portions that are in red because they bear very directly on the periodic review and discussion of developing a consistent review plan, indicating items to be reviewed and proposed timeline as well as additional resources needed, if any, and I'm sure that this is an item that you will see on our agenda at our next phone call, whenever that is, because we need to develop a consistent review plan and a proposed timeline and what additional resources we might need and that's part of the work that we need to do.

I think that maybe staff has suggested and I think it's correct that our plan will be better informed and more complete once we read the results of the GNSO review that are coming out from the Westlake group and then our proposed plan will be more informed. So if - I absolutely though do agree Amr with all of

your observations and I think I'm seeing in chat that others do as well. So if we can then possibly move on.

Some of these topics may come up again as we review the language of the draft letter that (Lori) and I had put together prior to the meeting and if we see things that we think need to be modified based on this discussion, I encourage everyone to chime in. I will go ahead and explain that there was quite a vigorous exchange, in particular, between Greg and Amr with respect to the motion procedures and lots of questions about whether we need more formal process in the operating procedures for seconding of motions and for identifying friendly amendments, adding friendly amendments, whether we should go through using the rules that are in (Robert's) rules or some other process and that is the source of item one.

So in this letter, all we're really doing is in the first paragraph just reporting our officers with me and (Lori) and then just reminding GNSO counsel that we have two areas of responsibility. One is for immediate problems that counsel may want us to take a look at that are procedural in nature and second is the periodic review. So the three items that are listed there are items that had either come up when I asked for input on what SCI members thought should be discussed with counsel or on items that had been raised last year or that appear also in the wiki as work plan items that SCI has responsibility to perform.

So I think our focus in the letter should or looking at this letter should be paragraphs one, two and three. Now, I consider it possible that people have not had a chance to read this. So let's just take 30 seconds, whatever it takes, to read through the letter with special focus on one, two and three and then we'll be ready to discuss. Okay. Is there anybody who needs more time to review this letter? If so, please raise your hand and I will invite comments from anyone. Mary Wong I see has a comment. Go ahead Mary.

Mary Wong: Hi Anne and hi everybody. Actually, I see Greg. So I'll just make a quick comment and then seat to Greg because I don't know if we have the same points if that's okay Greg because since the idea for this letter was moved within the SCI, the council had its last meeting in January, a week or so ago, and under the action items which was pending questions that may be sent to the SCI for review, the counsel has put those matters on hold and I believe it is in recognition of the pressing workload on the whole GNSO including on accountability and IANA stewardship transitions. So I don't know how this would affect either the wording of the letter or the suggestion that the SCI might want to make but I thought that that development should be noted to this group and on that note, I will pass over to Greg.

Anne Aikman-Scalase: Go ahead Greg. This is Anne but I guess first one quick question Mary is do you have the council resolution or counsel action? It seems like it's something that would be important for SCI to have as far as the - actually, I think it would've been good for SCI to have been notified of counsel action on this but I personally didn't have any notice of it.

Mary Wong: Anne, if I may. So at every GNSO council meeting, in addition to the roll call and all the other administrative items, one role in the administrative item if you like is the counsels review of action items on its list and that is to make sure, of course, that things are being followed up on or that people are doing what they're supposed to do and the action items pertaining to the SCI have been on that action items list for quite a while as Ron and Avri and others might recall and I think that was part of the basis for the SCI's discussion in Las Angeles last year about what to do about its next projects.

So what was discussed at that last meeting really was partly prioritization, I believe, but because the counsel had not itself made progress in terms of moving forward the work under pending items, they agreed to put those items on hold, like I said, pending the other work that's going on. Like I said, that's an agenda item on every council meeting although I could pose that the agenda doesn't actually list every single action item but the action items list is

published and all the counselors and the community have access to that list as well. So hopefully this helps on background.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Thank you Mary. Do we have the minutes reflecting that because it seems like - maybe this is a more general systemic type of question in terms of how we work with staff but I know that Greg is usually involved in the monitoring exactly what counsel does and what the minutes are but is there a way for SCI to be informed? Perhaps we should be regularly receiving copies of the GNSO counsel minutes that would reflect these items. Is that something that could be distributed by Julie or someone to send us the minutes?

Mary Wong: Anne, I think from the staff perspective, this could be one of the roles of a liaison that isn't different from the role of a liaison to other working groups and please note that I'm not pointing fingers at Avri or anybody for that matter because Avri is stretched pretty thin as I think we all know but I think from the staff perspective as well, each group whether it's a working group or a standing committee or what party or anything like that, can develop its own internal processes, if you like, for making sure these communications are received.

So maybe the group can ask Avri to be sure to send the minutes or if anything by the SCI comes up or indeed, each representative on the SCI can liaise with its counselors because the counselors certainly are part of the discussion and certainly have all the minutes, transcripts and so forth. So we're not trying to say we won't do it. We're just saying that there are avenues that may be helpful as well.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right. May I please place a request for staff to send the minutes to the SCI list?

Mary Wong: I think Julie has responded to say that she would send the link and I would note following up on Amr's comment that yes, the minutes are not prepared

immediately after the meeting. They do take some time because they first have to be reviewed by the counsel, chair and vice chairs and approved and then sent to the counsel for its approval at the next meeting. So we can do that but it may take some time in terms of when you get it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: That's great. Thanks so much Mary. See, I do want to recognize Greg who's had his hand up for quite some time and then I'll come back to Julie. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Anne. Greg Shatan again for the record. I'm not exactly sure what Mary just told us and I did look at the action items list that we were given the link to and on the two items relating to what they call a voting threshold that's really our consensus threshold's and amendments to motions that they're listed as on hold and I guess that gets to the point of friendly amendments in both the breadths of applicability of the 10 day, the waiver of the 10 day rule, which was not left clear enough in our last addition to the rules but these are both on hold. This seems to me - one interpretation of this is that our hands are tied unless we want to initiate a periodic review which we can initiate.

Our non-periodic work is only on request and there is no request. I understand this letter was drafted as basically a request for a request but I'm wondering if we've been overtaken by events or overtaken by non-events. It seems somewhat peculiar. Obviously there are those who are stretched then and me among them but nonetheless, I would expect that if I'm on this group, it's because I think I have the time necessary to deal with the typical workflow of the group and there are questions that are worth pursuing and I do believe the codification of defining and dealing with friendly amendments and resolving the ambiguity on the 10 day rule issue are things that the counsel would benefit from and that I don't think they would take up the business of the counsel over much.

So I don't know whether we go forward with this letter, if there should be some sort of dialogue with the counsel chairs and the SCI chair and vice

chair about whether we are in fact being mothballed. It's a very odd posture that we're currently in. I do have comments on the letter itself but I'll stop talking and see that staff - actually, the hands appear to be waving wildly in the chat. So I'll stop talking for the moment.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Great. I guess I would go ahead and recognize Julie. I see that there's been a lot of suggestion in the chat about things that individual SCI members and Avri could do in order to make SCI aware of the minutes but I would have to say that I personally would really appreciate staff forwarding the GNSO counsel minutes when they become available and I would like to ask Julie to do that or have Terri do it and I wonder if anybody else disagrees with that approach?

Julie Hedlund: Anne, this is Julie since you've asked me specifically and staff specifically. I would just note that this raises a precedent that we would actually have to consider as to whether or not staff has the resources to do this. It's not so much a matter of whether or not we are doing this just for the SCI. Right now, the staff support many working groups and those working groups have access to a multitude of materials that are posted online and in general, the working groups access that information themselves or are alerted by their liaisons to the counsel when those materials are available.

If staff now takes on this task, I think we would have to consider whether or not we can do it for all working groups because I imagine other working groups would have this request and also, I think it crosses over a little bit with what the liaison is expected to do. The liaisons are expected to pay attention to when action items arrive from the counsel affecting their working groups and to notify those working groups appropriately and then, of course, since transcripts of all of the meetings are available in various places online, those that are transcript and that is certainly the counsel, at any point in time, members of any working group can access those materials. So I would respectfully suggest that since this has been something that the liaisons have been doing that it makes more sense for the liaisons to do it and I also can

say that I cannot speak for staff and say that this is something that we can take on. We would have to consider our resources.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Thanks Julie and Mary, did you have some comment in addition to that because I would like to recognize Amr but whichever order you prefer Mary is fine.

Mary Wong: Actually, I was going to follow-up and respond to Greg if I may.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Mary Wong: I guess I didn't emphasize or maybe I omitted to mention because it was obvious and Anne, you had mentioned it before, that I think the reason or the primary substantive reason for the counsel agreeing to put the SCI items on hold is really because of the ongoing GNSO review that we've noted. No one has seen the initial report yet. So it may well be and again, this may be a task that the SCI can ask the liaison to do is that after the report comes out, after the working party and the groups have had a chance to look at it, that perhaps Avri can go back to the counsel and discuss the status of the SCI action items and secondly, perhaps in relation to this letter, maybe it could be rephrased to take onboard this new development but as you say Anne, inviting a dialogue with the counsel as to how best to proceed. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks Mary. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne. This is Amr. I think Julie covered part of what I wanted to say and I would certainly agree with her that using the counsel liaison to the SCI and perhaps the transcripts and recordings of counsel meetings as opposed to the minutes might be the most efficient way of providing notice to the SCI when SCI related issues come up in counsel calls simply because of what Mary said earlier and that there's a lengthy, time consuming process in preparing and producing the minutes and I personally don't believe waiting for

the minutes of meetings of the counsel call to meetings would necessarily be a very efficient way of providing notifications to this committee.

These minutes are sometimes even postponed for a meeting or two so we might end up waiting two or three months perhaps for minutes of meetings before we get notice on issues that pertain to our work. So yes, I would agree with Julie that using the liaison and transcripts are probably the best way to go about doing this.

The second issue I wanted to raise and I'm not entirely sure on this but in follow-up to what Greg was saying, as far as I am aware, the two action items on hold on the council agenda, I do not believe that they include a revision of the rule on the waiver, of the 10 day rule for motions. I think that the issue titled Building Thresholds -- which quite accurately or at least that probably should be consensus level thresholds -- I think that isn't follow-up of the recommendations.

This committee made a while ago that when we decided not to change those consensus level designation and add a footnote to them but said that we think that a full review of those consensus level reservations should be done. I don't think that even includes the 10 day motion issue that we feel is unresolved and warrants further work. I may be mistaken but I don't believe I am. So that may be something you might want to include a mention of in this letter or in some other capacity. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Great. Thanks Amr and Greg, did you have a comment on that?

Greg Shatan: Yes. Amr is actually right. The 10 day rule is not part of the amendments to motions issues which has been put on hold. So that issue not being on hold, we could perhaps take a slightly more assertive view that we would like to be tasked to continue to work on that as well as shaking free the amendments issue, if possible, in a slightly less assertive way. With regard to the

consensus level issue, this is one that unlike the other two I think actually may be best dealt with after the GNSO review and the Westlake Report and all that stuff comes out because I think that may conceivably relate to some of the output of that.

I doubt that issues as wonky or nerdy as the 10 day rule or friendly amendments or the like would surface anywhere in the GNSO review one way or the other but I could be wrong but consensus levels is a bigger issue and therefore one that would - it's been on hold now, I think, for a number of months unlike the amendment issue which I think is a newly put on hold. Actually, it says the entry date on that was also June 6. So maybe they've both been put on hold for a while but I think the recent issue that I raised where the friendly amendments were dealt with in a way that seemed to me to need further review was a new and more specific issue than the overall issue of making amendments and seconding and things like that.

So I would look at the friendly amendment issue and to be more specific, the issue there is that by taking an extremely liberal definition of what a friendly amendment is and an extremely liberal definition of what one does when an amendment is friendly, that it has the effect of completely taking the original amendment or the original motion off the table without any discussion or any ability to reopen it. So which may be appropriate in certain circumstances but not, I think, in all the circumstances that the current friendly amendment ad hoc process allows it to be.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Great. If I may, let's - we're getting toward the 2 o'clock hour here and later in other places. I think what I'm hearing from those who are commenting is that we, first of all, need to recognize that there are two items that were put on hold in the GNSO council meeting and I put some language in the chat where we could acknowledge that in the letter and then both Greg and Amr are saying that something that was not put on hold was a question of a 10 day motion waiver and whether that can occur in the context of is it

the resubmitted motion Greg and then also the friendly amendment were items that were not put on hold? Is that correct Greg?

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Okay. So those two items and in terms of the at least the periodic review, my take on this, and I'd like to know if anyone else agrees, is that the items two and three should actually remain in the draft letter simply because they are items dealing with periodic review even though it may be slow to develop in terms of work plan based on what we see in terms of the GNSO review and so, what we've proposed to do and see if (Lori) as vice chair agrees and others agree is to revise this letter in accordance with this discussion, send it out, again, to SCI members and then ask for any comments you may have, I would say, by Friday. I know our deadline is - or maybe by Monday. Our deadline for meeting the Singapore meeting where Avri would present the letter to counsel is February 1. So we would want to finalize it before them. Alternatively, I think it's possible we could work in one more call next week to review the letter. So I'd like to hear some thoughts on whether you want to schedule a call next week to review another draft. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: It's an old hand. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. I'm seeing in the chat that Ron is agreeing with the plan. Do folks prefer to respond to a new draft of the letter on the list or to schedule a call to finalize for next week, a week from today, on Tuesday? Let me see how many prefer to have a call next week. Could you put agree if you prefer to have a call?

Mary Wong: Anne, while people are thinking about it -- this is Mary -- we wonder whether given that people are going to be, I guess, planning for Singapore and everything, it might be better once you send the revised letter out to the list to

see if there are any other comments because it may be something that can easily be done by email.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: That sounds good and then I've got to ask the question again in a more positive way. How about we circulate a draft with the revisions that have been discussed and for now, we do not plan a call for next week. If you agree with that approach, can you mark your agree in Adobe please? All right. I'm seeing some agreement there. Super. Very good. All right. So we will undertake to redraft the letter and send it out to the list and then for now, I guess we will not schedule any other meeting at this time for SCI. Is there any other business that anyone would like to bring before the committee? Great. Well, seeing none, we'll try to stay on time and close our meeting and thank you everyone for your participation. If you do run into others that are on the SCI and who are enabled to participate in the call, just please alert them, hey, have you seen that letter that's going to go to GNSO counsel and hopefully we'll get a response from all of our groups. Thank you very much everyone. Bye-bye. The meeting is adjourned. Thanks.

Terri Agnew: (Troy), if you can please stop the recording.

Coordinator: Absolutely.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks everyone. Have a great day. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Mary Wong: Thank you. Thanks you all. 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.

END