

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Tuesday 12 May 2015 at 18:30 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the Tuesday 12 May 2015 at 18:30 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-12may15-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Angie Graves – BC – Primary
Anne Aikman Scalese – IPC – Primary - Chair
Jennifer Standiford - RrSG - Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP - Primary
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC Primary

Apologies:

Amr Elsadr – NCUC Alternate
Avri Doria – NCSG – Primary
Lori Schulman – IPC - Alternate

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have been started. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Chuck). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the SCI meeting on the 12th of May 2015. On the call today we have Angie Graves, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Rudi Vansnick, and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. We have received apologies from Avri Doria and Amr

Elsadr. From staff we have Julie Hedlund and Mary Wong, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you so much and over to you Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you very much. This is the SCI meeting. We're only going to go I think about half an hour today. We have very few participating in the call but that - actually the quality of participants I think is quite high, so we'll proceed to address our agenda.

First are there any revisions to statements of interest? In particular, I wonder, Rudi, is your statement of interest posted on the ICANN website for reference?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. Of course I've been at ICANN for several years and I think that my SOI is still updated with the latest information.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Well thank you very much, Rudi, and welcome. For those who didn't hear before, Rudi has assumed responsibilities for the primary representative of NPOC, replacing the slot that Lori Schulman vacated. So we welcome you, Rudi. Thank you for your participation today. And I wonder if you could also bring up the topic that - with respect to your alternate and we can address that with all the members here on the call.

Rudi Vansnick: Sure. Rudi for the transcript. As we, NPOC, are close to our elections, in fact we have announced the election nomination process a week ago, that's one of the reasons why we didn't yet nominate a representative for NPOC for the SCI group.

We are just waiting to see if in the call we are going to with our membership the 19th of this month, next week, we are looking into the membership to see if we can find somebody that is willing to join me in this working group so that

we don't have overload of people being involved in so many working groups, as personally also I have several working groups in which I have to be present and we try to share the work among all the members, if possible. That's the reason why we didn't yet have a decision taken on the alternate representative.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great thank you, Rudi. I personally do not see any problems with waiting to designate your alternate for that upcoming meeting. If there are any members who see a problem with that, you know, you could maybe check your disagree box. I just, you know, we've had different times in SCI when offices were or when designates or members were open for short periods of time, and I think the most important thing, Rudi, is that you are participating as the primary member. So it looks like we can just wait for your further news after that meeting. Thank you very much.

And I see that Jennifer has now also joined. Oh, and Wolf-Ulrich raised his hand. Wolf-Ulrich, is this regarding Rudi's comment or something else? Because Angie had her hand up as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: No it's regarding the membership in general.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: In general, okay. Okay so let me call on Angie first because she had raised her hand regarding I think a change in statement of interest. So, Angie, go ahead.

Angie Graves: Yes thank you. This is Angie, and actually I'm looking at the page -- thank you whoever posted that -- that's got the BC, showing Ron Andruff as the primary member and Angie Graves as the alternate. Unless something has changed that I'm not aware of, Ron Andruff has stepped down as the primary member. I am now the primary member from the BC.

We are looking to recruit an alternate. Ron is still attending calls as needed and as he is able, but my statement of interest has been updated to reflect that change in status. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thank you, Angie. That's consistent also with my understanding, and so I would ask staff to update that list and also to show the BC alternate I guess as open, or TBD, in the same way that we show that for a couple of other members.

And then we can go onto Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. For the ISPs it is as it as the time being so I'm the primary and then Osvaldo will be the alternate member as it used to be. I see on the list, and that's only if you look at the nominating, the NCA appointees, I think Jennifer is also not anymore an NCA, so that should also be - you should maybe refer to the council or to the very left NCA, (Thomas), and ask what they have in mind.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Could I also then ask staff to reach out to (Thomas) perhaps and try to determine where we are on our NomCom appointees? Hopefully he'll be able to respond by way of e-mail. And then I think also in the membership list for corrections, if I may, we do have on intellectual property constituency, Lori is still shown as the - oh no that's correct. That's correct, sorry. My mistake.

Okay so does that cover all the comments? Jennifer, may I ask you as I'm looking here with respect to the Registrar Stakeholder Group, is there an alternate member forthcoming or can you update us on any status report there? Jennifer, are you on mute or...? Okay. So is everyone else showing Jennifer in the - that Jennifer Standiford is participating? Oh okay, so she just - not yet on the audio bridge.

Does anyone have a potential dial out for Jennifer or maybe she's unable to do the call. I don't know. Maybe we can send her a note in chat, asking if she wants a dial out. But for now I think we will move on unless there are any other questions regarding the members of the committee.

So next item is the scheduling of our work in relation to the two items that GNSO Council has asked us to look into. There were two review requests that were finalized, and many thanks to Avri and to staff for getting those finalized, having them approved by council.

And I think the first issue, hmm these may be in a different order from what I was thinking, but are we - let me ask staff, are we talking about resubmission of a motion first? And do you have the actual review request? Is this the actual review request?

Julie Hedlund: This is the description of the two items. This is Julie Hedlund. I can pull up the two review request if you wish. I didn't know that we were going to look at - this is actually the text from the review request, I should be more clear about that. So what you hear is the text pulled directly from the review request.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I guess it doesn't read the same as the review requests that are in front of me. I thought...

Julie Hedlund: Okay well if you give me a minute, Anne -- this is Julie Hedlund -- I'll pull up the separate review requests. They have to - I'll have to pull up the documents in Word and save it in PDF. So that will take (unintelligible)

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay let's reverse the order then with respect to the agenda while Julie's doing that. Item number five, I'd like to discuss briefly the second category of the SCI's responsibility, which deals with the periodic review of GNSO procedures and the SCI's role in that.

I think from some of our discussions earlier this year we looked at the fact that there would be material coming out of the GNSO review that might well affect our - how we might want to move forward with respect to that second responsibility of periodic review of GNSO procedures.

I don't know if anyone has an update with respect to the status of that GNSO review process. I'm guessing that we would, as a group, still feel that the periodic review itself, that's premature at this point and that we should wait until we finish these two more immediate requests before we address the periodic review responsibilities. Does anyone have any comments on that particular aspect of the agenda?

Mary Wong: Anne, this is Mary from staff. And just to follow up on what you said, from what we know there's nothing that's really changed in terms of the plans or timeline for the GNSO review. So what you just said is probably correct in the sense of what might be best to do. I will note that the GNSO review folks, including Westlake, will be giving an update to the GNSO Council and community in the Buenos Aires meeting.

Before that, and in fact in 15 minutes, there's another GNSO review working party call. So to the extent that there's any changes to that timeline, I'm sure we'll find out about it in Buenos Aires, if not before. But from what I'm told, they are pretty much scheduled to go on with the report, publish it for public comment, and so from that perspective, nothing's changed, as far I know.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay great. Thank you, Mary. I think we will then, unless there's any different thought among the members, wait for more information either prior to or during the Buenos Aires meeting with respect to that.

So we can develop a schedule for starting our work on the two requests from GNSO. I think the first one was in relation to the process for submitting amendments to motion. And so we have a request that was consistent with our report to GNSO Council.

The request that came from GNSO talks about the fact that there's currently no process in place I think for submission of friendly amendments. And the current practice that has been identified within the operating procedures talks about section 3.3 I think it is that governs the submission of motions, and that's I believe being displayed by Julie right now.

So the process has been described in the request. I do think that all of you received process - copies of these review requests. Is that accurate, Mary and Julie? Have these finalized versions been circulated to all the members?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Yes they have. They were circulated at the time that the council approved them and approved the two motions in their sent agenda. So that was at least a couple of meetings ago. So I'm not sure if I have the right document up. I'm just checking if I have the one that's the amendment or if it's the motions item. Sorry I thought it was easier, and I put the two texts together and not realizing to bring up these separately.

So I'm just sort of trying to get this right. But yes absolutely, everybody got them immediately the next morning after - well immediately the same day they were approved by the council and they went out.

Anne Aikman-Scalase: Okay great. So, you know, we have these two issues, the first one being the friendly amendments, the second one being the interplay between the rule on resubmission of motions and the ten-day waiver rule. And the ten-day waiver rule, as everyone recalls, is something is that - well actually both of these topics SCI working on last year and the ten-day waiver has to do with submitting a motion in fewer than ten days before the council meeting. And if there's unanimous agreement councilors, council can vote on that motion.

And the resubmission rule was one that SCI also worked on in terms of what constitutes a properly resubmitted motion. And so this procedural issue has

to do with the interplay between those two rules. It was thought, by some at least, that it was not clear that the waiver rule could apply to a resubmitted motion.

So rather than discussing actually the merits or the substance of each of these topics, what I wanted to try to address in this short meeting was how we should approach the issue, whether we should approach them as a group of all of our members in calls to be scheduled and take the issues seriatim, you know, one after the other, and if so which one we would choose first or whether we should break into sub-teams to consider these issues and come back and report to SCI on recommendations for each of the items.

So if I could solicit opinions on the approach, I'd be happy to have some discussion on that. Anybody have any thoughts?

Mary Wong: Anne, this is Mary from staff. I guess one difficulty, well not a difficulty but one potential challenge, is that we seem in the SCI to be going through some changes of membership and for example I think Rudi said NPOC would not have their elections till June.

So considering the numbers right now, the sub-team approach may be a little challenging, and there's some possible interplay between these two as well. So we wonder whether it would be helpful for this group at the moment to maybe consider doing one first. And then if it turns out that a sub-team approach might be more optimal to switch to that at the appropriate time when we've got more hands on deck.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Yes I think that's a very good observation, Mary, and I'm very interested to hear also what you think is the possible interplays. And I can see that that's - that is going to be an issue in the context of a motion being amended during a council meeting, so. But let me recognize Rudi, who has his hand up and is now unmuted. Go ahead, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Well as Mary was saying, looking to the many changes that the committee is going through in membership, I think it's wise to maybe have a good overview of the status of what is considered to be urgent in the sense of decisions to be taken and what are items that can delay till the next meeting, physical meeting for instance in Buenos Aires.

And that would allow newcomers in the committee to understand where we are and what are the requirement that we need to take to our communities, to our constituencies, and have a consensus agreement within the constituency in order to make our voice here in the committee. That's my perception of how I feel things are actually a bit difficult to decide which direction to go.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you, Rudi. I guess I would with respect to, you know, the schedule for undertaking the work, we do within SCI, try to accomplish work on conference call meetings that occur in between the ICANN meetings. I'm afraid that if we did in fact, you know, wait for Buenos Aires meeting we wouldn't have any progress or even methodology to report to council, which we are required to do at every ICANN meeting.

I think that in terms of the participation that we have, I don't know if there are ways that we could schedule a call on a different day that would avoid some of the other calls or if it's just, you know, a fact of our current existence within the ICANN community that there are so many things that are going on at once that we just have to proceed with a schedule that SCI has always worked on.

Mary, do you have any thoughts, or Wolf-Ulrich, on that point?

Mary Wong: Anne, this is Mary. I was just looking at the sort of general policy calendar, and it looks like the IANA CWG has standing calls basically that overlap with this time for the next few weeks, and there's also some accountability calls, which these I don't know if they would continue but my expectation as I'm

sure as everyone's is that the intensity and frequency of those calls will probably be more or less the same leading into Buenos Aires.

That probably means for IANA that we will not have Avri for example. I don't whether it will impact other members of this committee. So off the top of my head I don't necessarily have a good solution, but since we've got the specific folks on this call maybe amongst ourselves we could figure out if this is a good time and carry on, unless somebody objects.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I see that in the chat that Rudi has suggested an additional call in two weeks. I do think that SCI has generally worked on the basis of doing a call every two weeks. But perhaps, Mary, if you could take a look at the calendar and maybe suggest a different day on the list after looking at it that doesn't involve, you know, it would be nice if Avri could - would be able to participate. I'm sorry, go ahead, Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Well I'm using my calendar and in my calendar I have all the meetings that are scheduled by ICANN which I need to be in. And actually I don't see any in the next two weeks a call for the SCI group, so maybe it's good if there is a frequency of every two weeks that it would be put in the calendar so that we have an overview of where are the overlaps.

It just happened today that there is a call for SO/AC/SG leadership call that falls (unintelligible) together with the PDP working group with (Cheyenne), and it's painful if you have to always so okay sorry but I have to be in another meeting. So it's good if you have a good view upfront the weeks to come where the meetings are going to be scheduled, so it could be any possibility to integrate it into the calendar so that we have a good view on it. It makes life a bit easier.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thanks. Is there a way, Mary, that we could send out some kind of a poll with respect to a day that would work for every two weeks by - with your making reference to the policy calendar?

Mary Wong: Anne, yes we can do that. And as Rudi notes, we haven't scheduled another call, so Julie and I can take a quick look at the next few weeks. Our suspicion is probably that there won't be a totally un-conflicted time, so we can send out a doodle with this Tuesday time, every two weeks, and maybe one or two other dates.

And to follow up on Rudi's comments, once each meeting is confirmed, not only does every member get a calendar invite, as you all know, but that it actually goes into the main policy calendar as well. So hopefully that will be helpful to people going forward, especially newer members of our group.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great thank you very much, Mary. And then the other question I'd like to get to rather quickly would be with respect to your recommendation, Mary, as to which of these issues we should take up first in our - for example in our next call. We'll be hopeful that sometime during that time we'll get a volunteer in the next little while to operate in the office of vice chair, but do you think, Mary, that it would be better for us to take up first the issue of the amendments to the motion process or better for us to take up first the issue of the interplay between resubmission of a motion and the ten-day waiver rule?

Mary Wong: Hi again, Anne and everyone. Actually Julie and I were just discussing that, and we thought that it might be preferable to do the latter first, in other words the question of the, you know, waiver and the resubmission, for a couple of reasons. One is that the resubmission question has already been considered by the SCI but not this specific aspect.

And I think as Amr and other noted when we sort of wrapped up that work that this is something that would be outstanding. So it seems to make logical sense to just go back and start with that. The other reason, and there may be

others, is that for the amendments to motions and forth, since the council does have a customary practice that they don't seem to have too much trouble with in terms of timing, again it seemed to point to the waiver and resubmission referral as being the more obvious choice to go first.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay great. Well that makes sense to me. I think given that it is noon and I anticipated people should be able to count on this being a 30-minute meeting I think that we could then just ask staff to send out, you know, information on possible dates for a call in roughly two weeks and every two weeks thereafter leading up to Buenos Aires and to work first on the issue of resubmission of motion and ten-day waiver rule interaction.

So is there any other business that anyone would like to have addressed on this particular short call? And seeing none, I think we can try to adjourn on time. Oh wait, somebody's typing. Rudi's typing and just saying thank you. So thanks to all you for giving us this half hour, and we look forward to working together on our first issue in 2015 in our next call. And thank you to staff, Mary and Julie, Nathalie, thank you very much.

Bye, everyone.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Anne. Thanks, everybody.

Man: Thank you very much.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone.

Nathalie Peregrine: (Chuck), we can now stop the recordings. This call is over.

END