Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on Thursday the 8th of October, 2015.

On the call today we have Anne Aikman-Scalese, Angie Graves, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben and Amr Elsadr. We have apologies from Lori Schulman and Rudi Vansnick. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong and myself, Terri Agnew.
I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you, Terri and welcome, everyone. I’m hoping that we’ll have a short meeting here today. There isn’t a lot of business to do but if there are any updates to Statements of Interest please raise your hand now and let us know.

Okay, seeing none, thanks also to everyone for their participation. I did want to ask staff to point out if there are any unappointed offices from members of SCI at this time. So this is just a reminder to the various members about any open offices.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Anne, this is Julie Hedlund. I can address that. So I’m looking at the list of members and we did send out a couple of reminders. And of course there’s always the possibility that maybe we’ve missed something or something didn’t come up to us. But the vacancy that I note is the Business Constituency has a primary member who is Angie Graves. I’m not showing an alternate member for that organization.

And in addition, we do not have a primary Nominating Committee appointee. Thomas Rickert is the alternate member. And I think because we have people coming and going from the Council, I think that is going to need to be an item to be addressed by the Council probably I think at its wrap up meeting in this coming ICANN meeting. And I’ll confirm that with other staff to make sure that’s the appropriate approach.

And then also the Not for Profit Organization’s Constituency has as its primary member Rudi Vansnick. I do not show an alternate member for that group.
Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And finally I'll just note, and just because I know you have it on the schedule here as well, but Avri Doria will be leaving the Council. She is currently the SCI liaison to the Council. And that generally is a Council member and it generally is someone who is - the Council asks for volunteers and selects. And that is, as I believe Marika Konings confirmed on one of the emails I think that Rudi and you, Anne, have seen with that is an item for the wrap up session that the Council will hold on Thursday in Dublin.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay so Angie - oh what happened to Angie?

Angie Graves: Angie is here. Just having audio difficulties and I'm out of the Adobe.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh okay, that's great. Angie, would you be able to follow up with the BC to look for an alternate? I mean, I realize it's not super critical but it's just a housekeeping matter. So, I mean, we're happy that you're here and actively participating but you may want to just send a note to your folks about appointing an alternate.

Angie Graves: Yes. Thank you. May I respond to that?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sure.

Angie Graves: This is Angie Graves from the Business Constituency. And we are lacking an alternate. It is very unfortunate situation for me that we do not have an alternate. But it almost every meeting, and in all of our face to face meetings in 2015 it has been raised. And the recruiting effort has not ceased. And the notes continue to go out. So I'm open to new strategies if anybody - I don't - not quite sure if people are not compelled enough. I've explained to them that the time commitment is not horrendous. And so I'm open to anybody with new strategies. But we are working diligently to get an alternate. Thank you.
Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you, Angie. And I was wondering, are you going to be able to attend in Dublin?

Angie Graves: I’m sorry. I’m having audio difficulties. Could you repeat that please?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, it’s Anne again. And I was wondering if you’re going to be able to attend in Dublin. I didn’t know...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: And do you think it would be possible to get the possible appointment of an alternate onto the BC’s very crowded agenda in the meeting in Dublin? Is that a possibility?

Angie Graves: Get it added to our meeting agenda? I think it already is on our meeting agenda. I’m relentless about this.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh okay, great. Well that’s great news. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Angie Graves: And even better news if we get the alternate. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Well thank you for your diligence, we really appreciate that. Then with respect to the NomComm, you know, certainly - who is the current primary appointee? Is there not a primary appointee?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. No there is no primary appointee. Thomas Rickert is the second - is the alternate, pardon me.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right. And Thomas obviously right now doesn’t have time to participate. I’m not sure where - how we can follow up with that. Julie, do you have a recommendation to how we can...
Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'll take the - I will take the action to go ahead and follow up with that. I did note that we had not - we had Jen Wolfe in that spot. We had not, if I remember correctly, we had not replaced her. Thomas could not step up because of his commitments. You know, and as we do have some changes on the Council coming up I will make sure that this is a topic. I think it's probably appropriate again to the wrap up session at the GNSO Council meeting in Dublin.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great.

Julie Hedlund: And I'll confer with my colleagues - oh and I see that Mary is letting me know, we do have two NomComms coming to the Council after October. So as part of the new Council changes. So we can follow up and find out if those two people are available to be - or if any of the two new people are available or willing to be, say, primary or alternate.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay, thank you Julie. And this is Anne again. And I'll personally follow up with Rudi with respect to the alternate for NPOC. So moving on then to the next agenda item, just want to thank everybody in relation to the consensus call on the 10-day waiver rule. We do have a letter to Council with respect to that matter that both Rudi and I have signed. You've all seen the letter. And we will be submitting it by the 11th actually for the Council's consideration.

And our second item in - that we've been working on in relation to the current practice on amendments to motions, is Item Number 4 on the agenda. We had super work from Mary Wong with respect to documenting the current procedure on amendments to motions. And then there was input on the list I think from both Wolf-Ulrich and Amr. And so what Julie has posted is the revised procedure for everyone's review.
What we’d like to do if possible is also to transmit this to Council if there’s enough of an agreement. And allow Council to also consider this in terms of whether they view it as accurate with respect to the current procedure. And then we could, from that point in time, once Council confirmed, we could proceed with the rest of our work to analyze whether any changes are recommended.

So do I have any comments on the current draft of the documentation of the current GNSO procedure for amendments to motions? Does this look good to everyone? Okay, Wolf-Ulrich please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knaben: Yes. Hi. Its Wolf-Ulrich speaking. And well I had already one comment and this is incorporate it now in blue in the draft that was just only notes from my side with regards that the number of seconders is open. So and then it’s reflected in what Julie inserted here.

I think, on the other hand, you know, all the steps here encountered are very well reflecting the actual practice. And I did not think about - you know, and that's what I understand is to be discussed whether something should be amended should be added and to put forward - we put forward to the Council. So the status from my side is clear as it is. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great, thank you. I’ll go ahead and call on Amr in relation to this document given his experience on Council. And Amr, are you satisfied, happy with this write up? Have you had a chance to look at it further since it was amended? Oh I think you’re on mute. Oh coming off...

Amr Elsadr: Hi, thanks Anne. This is Amr. Yeah, all right you can all hear me now.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Hello. All right great. Yeah thanks. I think the document is fine. I went over it after the redline changes were made regard to the comments that Wolf-Ulrich
and I submitted. Yeah, I think they were captured nicely. I think in general it was fine to begin with and it’s - its fine now. It seems to accurately reflect the current practices on the GNSO Council. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Very good. And, Angie, I know you’re on the phone. Did you have any further comments on this or any additional feedback on our procedure going forward?

Angie Graves: This is Angie. Thank you for asking. And I like the way it looks now.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay great. Well I’d like to put the question forward as to whether anyone thinks there would be a problem transmitting this to Council now given the low number of people on the call. I think Julie was pointing out that because this is not really a request for a change or a recommendation but it doesn’t appear from our procedures that we need a consensus call on this particular document.

If anyone has something to contribute in that regard whether you recommend that we delay transmitting this to Council or whether you think it would be fine to send it with a cover letter for their consideration I’d like to solicit comments on that.

And I did see Julie’s hand go up so I will recognize her first and then Amr after that. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: I just - Mary and I were conferring and one possibility might just be to do a last call with a, you know, document today. And if there was no comment, you know, again no objections then it could, you know, be sent - transmitted via a short letter tomorrow in advance of the document deadline. But let me defer to Amr as well.
Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Well thank you very much. I see Wolf-Ulrich agrees with that approach and we'll note that in the transcript. And, Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Anne. This is Amr again. I just wanted to ask when you say you want to transmit this part of a letter to the GNSO Council for consideration what exactly are we asking the Council to consider? Just sort of a rubber stamp the document saying that this is indeed the current practice? Or is there something else we're asking Council to do? Thanks.

And I'm asking this because that may determine whether I feel we need a consensus call or not so just thought I'd throw that out there. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Amr. I think that's a very good point. And what we are proposing is simply to transmit it to Council for consideration as to whether it's an accurate documentation of the current practice. It would not be by way of, you know, recommending this specific codification or by way of saying that there should be no changes. It would just simply be asking them to confirm that we've accurately summarized the current practice.

So I see that you're agreeing to that approach. And that is, you know, it's a very limited approach. But I do also like the idea of sending that out for - with the cover letter that clarifies that exactly what we are asking and sending that out for a short period. So, Julie, I'll recognize you. Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Anne. This is Julie Hedlund. I'll just note that as Mary has reminded me that the Council did actually ask the SCI to document the current practice. So we can reference that in the letter that we are simply fulfilling the first part of their request - the request to look at this particular issue. So the first is - and I think Marika had mentioned this before on the call on the 17th that it's a two part process, the first is to document the current practice which we have done and present that to the Council; and the second part then is for the
group to, you know, consider possible changes to the operating procedures as far as, you know, making it a formal as opposed to informal process.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Well many thanks for that, Mary. It’s always good to get that reminder. And thanks, Julie. So I think based on our discussion thus far we would be, you know, well within practice of moving forward with a letter, which I believe Julie has volunteered to draft. And then to circulate, you know, reciting that this is the first part of the request and putting that letter out at least for a speak now or forever hold your peace if you have any changes or objections.

And I’d like to ask Julie to go ahead and do that. And I will try to make sure that I can review that letter very quickly and ask everyone else to do so as well when it does go out from Julie.

So then if there’s no further discussion of that we will move on to Item 5 and that’s the opening that Julie mentioned with respect to the Council liaison position for 2016. And, I mean, obviously to be perfectly clear, SCI itself is not involved in that selection. But we did want to alert those who are serving on Council that this will be an open position.

I know that in the first couple of years that I was on SCI Wolf-Ulrich assumed that responsibility and he was our Council liaison. And I don’t know if either Wolf-Ulrich or Amr, you know, is interested in assuming this responsibility but perhaps you could consider that in relation to future discussions that will occur at Council.

Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, thanks, Anne. Its Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well raising my hand doesn’t say I’m interested in. So well I would like to suggest, well, to put that question to the new Council. So I saw we have a lot of new councilors on the list as well.
I’m not sure whether some of them will be also ready, well, to participate in the SCI also. This has to be asked for I think this question could be asked of the new Council. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. And what do you think is the proper procedural context for that, Wolf-Ulrich and Amr? Should it be at all mentioned in our report or should it be considered that it’s obvious and that I know that Avri will be planning to speak in the update portion of our report and to state that a new Council liaison will be needed. That’s probably sufficient to cover it without putting it in our reporting slides. But I would appreciate comments on the approach taken there. Shall we just leave that Avri?

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...Mary was writing in the chat and that’s a procedure as usual I understand. So to bring that up in the wrap up session of the Council. So the question itself. And then, you know, Jonathan - I mean, the new Council chair will take it to the next session of the Council and then ask for that. So I think I understand that in that direction.


Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks, Anne. This is Amr. Yeah, I’m confident that the GNSO Council will address this or at least bring it up during the wrap up session as Mary has indicated in the chat. GNSO Council typically does deal with open liaison spots during that meeting.

However, we will have a new chair for the GNSO Council at the wrap up meeting as well. And Avri will not be a sitting councilor at that meeting either. So, yeah, although I’m sure - will make sure it is on the agenda I wouldn’t say it’s a bad idea to sort of just include maybe a bullet in the SCI update to the GNSO during the weekend just saying that, you know, the SCI is aware that
we need a new liaison to the GNSO Council and we'll be waiting for whatever the Council comes up with. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Very good. Well thank you very much, Amr. We'll put that in potentially as the last bullet and then hand the microphone over to Avri for further comments. So thanks, everyone, for all of those comments. I think it's very clear where we will head from here. And on the item Number 6, this is a reminder that we do have an SCI meeting from 8:00 to 9:00 am Dublin. I noted on the schedule for Dublin that that meeting is in a different room from the GNSO Council meeting.

In the past we've had our early morning meeting in the same room as GNSO Council and so this - I don't know how far away those two meeting rooms are from each other. But I also note that our meeting for report to Council gives us 15 minutes to travel from the first meeting room over to the Council meeting room because we are not first on Council’s agenda this time, we are second so that’s good.

If there are items that people would like to include on the agenda for that meeting in Dublin from 8:00 to 9:00 am it would be a good time for you to think about that and to suggest things on the list perhaps. I know one thing we will need to address would be the office of chair for next year potentially beginning to think about that. And questions about, you know, how we want to proceed with our work as soon as we receive the confirmation from Council in relation to the friendly amendments procedure. So probably have an item for, you know, discussion about that.

And I’m not sure if there are any other topics that should be included. But if you think of some please post them to the list. And certainly looking forward to seeing you all in person in Dublin. It should be a very exciting action-packed meeting.
Any thoughts on the agenda at this time? Okay great. I don’t see anything for right now but do look forward to seeing you all. And I’ll also make the call for any other business at this time.

And seeing none if everyone is in agreement we will adjourn this meeting of the SCI. And thanks, everyone.


Anne Aikman-Scalese: Bye-bye. See you in Dublin.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks everyone. Safe travels. See you soon.


Julie Hedlund: Bye-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