

ICANN Transcription
The Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation Sub team A
Tuesday 19 January 2016 at 1800 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of The Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation Sub team A call on the Tuesday 19 January 2016 at 18:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-sci-19jan16-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Angie Graves – BC – Primary
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC – Primary – Vice Chair
Sara Bockey – RrSG - Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary

No Apologies

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Michelle DeSmyter

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

(Michelle DeSmyter): Great. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening.

Welcome to the SCI Sub-Team A meeting on the 19th of January, 1800 UTC.

On the call today we have Rudi Vansnick, Sara Bockey, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Angie Graves. We have no apologies. And from ICANN Staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong and myself Michelle DeSmyter.

I would like to remind you all too please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you (Michelle) and I'll just note for the transcript that Mary Wong also has joined us from staff.

Michelle DeSmyter: Fantastic. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: No, thank you. So we don't have a formal chair for this group. And it's ideal if staff does not chair a group. If better if the SCI members, one of the members should be the chair. Is there someone who would like to volunteer?

I'm hearing...

Rudy Vansnick: Not everybody at the same time. It's Rudy for the transcript. Well I'm actually the SCI chair, but as I was explaining to Julie that perhaps it would be good that one of you could take over the chairing position in this sub-team so that everybody has a chance to chair a committee.

And that it's not always let's say the committee chair that takes the lead in everything. So I would prefer if somebody wants to take the lead in here, you're welcome to take the chair position here.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. Rudy I'm not hearing any takers. If somebody is speaking and is on mute, let us know if you do want to take up Rudy's offer to chair.

Rudy Vansnick: Well Rudy for the transcript. If silence means that you prefer that I stand on the chair to chair this sub-team, I will do so. And perhaps for next call we can have relay on someone else.

So don't - let us not waste time. It's precious for everybody. I would like to start with the mission that we have here. But first of all, we have to review the statement of interest. And I would like to know if someone has any changes in the statement of interest, let us know.

If not, we can move on through the most important point of the agenda especially about the current practice in relation to the motion, the (manlin) amendment, sorry. Yes, I'm sorry. It's my fourth meeting already today, so I'm getting a bit tired.

When I go back to the initial creation of this sub-team, the question that we have on the table is if the SCI believes that the current practices are inappropriate. The SCI should convey its reasons for such belief to the council and develop new processes to govern the (coming) of motions and amendments to motions.

I think if I'm not wrong, that's the basic question that is on our table that we need to take care of. And Julie was so kind to put up different steps that are in fact on the actual list based on the draft of October 8 based on discussions that we had previously.

So I don't know is there - if we agreed that this is the mission we need to accomplish. Then we can agree on the next steps to discuss the context of the discussion itself. Is everybody happy with the question that was in front of us?

Yes I see Angie agrees. I supposed that silence means that we accept that information and move forward to the next steps. Yes thank you Julie. You referred us to the Number 7 in the document. Describe the specific changes you propose to address the identified issues of problems.

And (unintelligible) here. The GNSO Council requests that the SCI clarifies that the existing customary practices of the GNSO Council as described to (both).

The SCI believes that the current practice is not appropriate. Yes, I should convey its reasons. It's the text that I have earlier that continues on the next page where you see this GNSO Council suggests that in carrying out the staff, the SCI consult for GNSO chairs and councilors as well as commonly accepted guides and practices such as (more) tools of order and other ICANN bodies such as the board from other SCOs and ACs.

And that last sentence is a quite important one. What I understand is that the GNSO Council gives us the advice to look backwards and have input from previous councilors and previous chairs to see what happened in the past in order to allow us to have an indication of what worked and what didn't work, at least that's my understanding.

And also try to use existing methods of meetings and (revoking) orders so that we are in line with what is traditionally used. At least that's my understanding. I would like to check with you if you have the same association of that text.

That means that there is a lot of work in that if we need to consult these chairs and councilors, we will have to call on them and get them in one of our meetings in order to have the value of it.

So I'm just wondering if that's an action we could take. Perhaps I have to go and ask Julie or Mary who have quite a long-standing in these activities if that's a good approach to do is to call on previous ones? Yes Mary. I see you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Mary Wong: Yes thank you Rudy and hello everybody. Rudy I think that that's probably you're right. The reason that the Council put in this line in its request. So as you said it could be quite defensive.

So one way that the SCI could approach this part is obviously to ask the existing members of the SCI who are former councilors and Wolf-Ulrich of course is a member of this group.

You could, as a sub-team also been developing an email that we could send on your behalf to previous council chairs and councilors. And, you know, we could just also send them to a selection because as you noted, you know, going back all the way to, you know, whenever the council was founded and every single councilor, you know, might be somewhat excessive.

Then the question then besides, you know, who you want to approach and in the format of the approach would be I think helpful if this sub-team could discuss whether, you know, the central question which is whether this practice as documented in the document here that was sent to the former council, whether the practice is appropriate.

What gaps there might be and, you know, what suggestions this sub-team might have to fill that. So that's one way to do it. And that's one type of approach.

Alternatively you could, you know, send the letter or the email and solicit suggestions. But I'm not sure that that would be as helpful to this sub-team because that would be more open ended. So it may be more helpful to start with some specific ideas.

So for example this sub-team could say, you know, we think that this is a satisfactory approach. However, we notice, you know, from previous incidents, maybe reported by a couple of current SCI members who are on

the council that a certain new rule may want to be developed for this kind of situation which is not covered.

My sense is that that may be more helpful to you in getting more concrete input from former council members. Thanks.

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you very much Mary. That's indeed I think a very great proposal that we first do some analyzing of the text we have in front of us. And then address the councilors and previous chairs to have a better understanding of what we could forward. I see Wolf-Ulrich you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, hello. Hello Rudy and others. I'm sorry, I just got connected, so I could not follow all what you have said here in between. I do hope I'm updated.

So my first question is here with regard, and I know you were going through it, at least to our task here. And my first question is related. Is the task related to the entire process of filing motions and handling motions within the GNSO that you say as a whole? Not just on the councilors but also in a precatory look with regard to timing and all these things.

Or is it just related to some specific aspects which have been discussed in the past? And the SCI already I see for example the question of amendments and these things. So this is the first thing.

So and then related to this question how to proceed. Well I would join that what I have heard that we should pick up let me say some members of the council from the different and the various parts of the councilor or the GNSO which are contributing to the process itself.

And hearing from their point of view (unintelligible). What we have to do then is kind of elaborating a kind of question list or questionnaire which we are

going to present to them or which we are going to discuss with them. So I leave it as it is at the time being. So I do hope I'm updated. Thank you.

Rudy Vansnick: Thank you very much Wolf-Ulrich. Rudy for the transcript. But I think you asked the right question. What's the exact definition and what are the terms on which we have to take action.

And I think that Julie just put up the page where as far as I understood we have motions. We have seconders of motions and we have amendments. Now those are three, as far as I recognize, the three terms that actually are on the table.

And the context of these terms is when a motion has been brought up, what are the correct steps. And I remember the discussions during one of the GNSO Council meetings. I think it was in Singapore that we had this discussion about friendly amendments and not seconding a friendly amendment.

And so I think it's a quite large scope that we have in front of us. And Mary was also putting in the chat it's also the proposal of a motion that is on the question list.

So perhaps it's good if we try to start from the beginning point, as we see on I think it's just a few lines before where the description was given by the GNSO where we have Step 1, a motion is something (unintelligible) GNSO Council by a current GNSO Council Member.

The Council makes friendly request that the motion be seconded by another GNSO Council Member. So this is the first step. And I think that this is quite correct that this is the normal way of doing things and there's nothing that has to be changed at that level, as far as I have seen the procedures.

And then we move on to Step 2 where a different GNSO Councilor normally seconds the submitted motion so that we can move on to Step Number 3. If they submit it in time for the next GNSO Council meeting, the motion is placed on the Council's meeting agenda and published on the motions page of the Council Wiki space.

That's, yes, indeed the flow of how the actions are taking place. So first on the main list, when there is a second on that motion, it goes to the agenda of the meeting, of the next meeting. And then the motion is discussed at the GNSO Council meeting.

That seems to me the logical way things would happen. We had the discussion about the timing that is requested to get it on the agenda. And if I'm not wrong, it's 10 days before the GNSO Council meeting the motion has to be posted. That was one of the discussions also if I'm not wrong.

And so and on this process I don't see immediately any difficulty of handling the question. I'm trying to follow also the chat. But I see that Julie Hedlund has mentioned Number 6. And I'd like a clarification quickly to risk of inconsistency in those gaps relating to my notes (unintelligible). Yes.

Yes that's a good question. (Unintelligible) is there a kind of flowchart or document flow that is used in doing these steps? I think that's something that we could easily put together for the next call. And that could be used to amend all the actions that we think are required or should be modified.

At least that's a proposal. That's my personal approach. I would like to hear from you all if that's the first step we would go to try to make (committees) of the different steps and different actions in timing and in definition so that we get a good understanding of the problem itself.

Is that something that we can agree on? Does anybody have any other proposal? So I'm not hearing anybody. I can consider silence be acceptance.

So that the first get from staff a flowchart of how the process is visually represented. And that would probably help outside the team also to have a better understanding of the whole issue in itself.

Once we have that done we could build on - and I would prefer that we build on that one. I'm going to the details of the question that we have. And the question describes clear that we need to figure out if the current practices are inappropriate.

And that's probably one of the big questions where we need a bit more detail on the different ways of executing the different steps as we have them in front of us. As I mentioned already, for instance there can be a kind of delay, like 10 days before the Council meeting.

So I think it's not just having a flowchart. It's also having a timing scheme that we know if things are done within the right timing, and probably, at least myself, I have to go a little bit more into the details of the procedures. But I'm counting on experience that Wolf-Ulrich can bring to the table in having a look of what are all the possible issues that can be raised during the different steps - during the execution of the different steps.

For instance, my personal question would be the (second one). Should that be done also 10 days before, or can that be done meanwhile? I think that's a quite interesting question to solve to get clearance for everybody. But maybe Wolf you have more experience as you have been on the Council. Do you know of any cases where this was effectively an issue where we could say that the process were not executed in an appropriate way?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Rudy, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. You mean, so if I understood correctly, you mean the process of coming up with a motion and bringing a motion to the Council as a whole.

So well there has been problems with doing something or deciding something in the process. Was that your question related to?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes Wolf. That's exactly what I wanted to know if in the - when a motion came to the council, were there cases where there were some difficulties in staying within the process and within the timing and within the procedures as described?

As far as I remember, in Singapore we had a case where there was a lot of discussions going on about, I think about even a discussion of motion and amendments. Both cases popped up where there was a discussion about if it was - an amendment was done in time or the motion was done in time. I can't remember exactly.

But I think it would be good if you could highlight cases that are indicating that there is need for improvement of the procedures itself.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes, we had several discussions about the timing of motion, the deferral of motion, the - I remember there was - the very last case, it was about the deferral of motions that we didn't come to a very let me say clear conclusion about it.

We just deferred that. And we're saying okay, let's wait and see what's going to happen. There was one case, I don't remember exactly what it was, but maybe Mary Wong knows better about that really at the end because of our discussions within the SCI, we didn't come to a right conclusion.

And that okay, let's - the case maybe is rare. And let's just see what is going to happen. I think it was in relation with the obviously a question of bringing up again the motion which has been deferred or which has not been passed or in this case.

There were several cases where discussions came up. And I think it would be good. So I'm not just - I don't have them all in my mind at the time being. But it would be good if you could bring it up.

I myself I think over and bring up it to the list. And maybe if we have some help from staff to that, they would be really helpful. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Wolf-Ulrich. And as I'm also following the chat, the reason why I was bringing up the question about the timing of the second of the motion. Well, Step 3 is not really clear in the sense of should the motion already be seconded before it has been moved - passed to the Council - to the Council agenda? Because that means that you have to speak to the 10 days included the seconding.

And indeed the discussion in Singapore was about a motion that was brought back to the Council. And that was deferred on the previous meeting. And I think that was in fact the trigger of our mission here. It was the fact that there was no clear definition in the procedures how this should have been handled.

But instead of moving immediately to that critical case, I would like to go through the (whole first) and see if we can improve the description of the different steps in such a way that we can avoid such a discussion. Wolf-Ulrich I see you have your hand up. You have the mic.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I think Julie was also mentioning on the chat with regard to the seconding and amendment something. And this is the present stages. You know, there is no - nothing is fixed with regards to the timing.

That which means a motion usually could be seconded until the very last minute, you know. When the motion came up to the table, it was called to the table at this meeting that should be moved. Then - and there was no second

available, then the chair was asking, you know, is somebody going to second that?

And in all these cases, it was seconded. I can't remember a case where it was not seconded. So the question is here just, which I understand, this team should discuss it if there is a need to alter or to modify that kind of rule or to fix it as a rule as it is and the pros and cons. So that's what I understand. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. And Rudi for the transcript. Well, indeed it is my understanding if for instance a motion was brought up, it goes to the agenda. And that there is no seconding.

It means that that motion can't be brought up again at the next meeting. And then we enter into the big discussion happening in Singapore where in fact the motion was deferred due to lack of seconding.

So I think it is important that this step be clearly defined if that there is a need for timing because it's a personal reaction and perception that I have when I see that the motion has not as a counselor, acting as a counselor. I see a motion is on the table, but nobody is seconding.

Well I'm not consulting my (unintelligible) my stakeholder group because I considered that that motion would not pass. I do not have to discuss it with my group. But if you know that if there is a need for a seconding before it can go to the agenda, well you know that at that time you need to take the case up in your stakeholder group.

That these steps that I think to me, and if I would become a new councilor, that would be a question that I would have. Julie you have your hand up. You have the mic.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. But, (unintelligible). Yes, I think, you know, the issue at hand here is, as I noted in the chat the current and formal process does not set a deadline for when a motion a seconded.

And so indeed, a motion can be submitted and the motion must be submitted. That is one deadline that is clear and is in the procedures. The motion must be submitted in order to be considered by the 10 day deadline before the next council meeting.

But there is no written deadline for a seconder nor is there a deadline for amendments. And indeed, seconds have been provided during council meetings, as I think Wolf-Ulrich noted, and amendments, friendly or otherwise, have been submitted during council meetings.

And so the issue, as I think you've identified here Rudi, is that this sub-team should ask itself whether or not we do need to insert a deadline into the process? Or has there been issues of confusion?

And I think you have raised one relating to Singapore where, you know, there is no seconder. And so of course the motion is not considered. And it can, since it is not considered it could be considered at a subsequent meeting. So anyway, I think - I hope that is helpful.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. Yes indeed, really for the draft it is quite helpful. And again, the question that I would have is when the motion was not seconded, is that motion automatically transferred to the next meeting call?

As far as I've seen with these, that's not mentioned. So I think there's a lot of things that we need to clarify that everybody has a good understanding and there is no discussion about things that are not written, at least that's my personal perception. Wolf-Ulrich you have your hand up. You have the mic.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Rudi. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well with regards to seconding the motion, I think the question here is except if - what Julie was saying. So the motion should be brought up within the 10 days deadline.

And the question here is then if the mo - the act of bringing a motion to the council, is that such a, let me say value or such a category that you need two people to support it. So to say that it is going to be forward - to be put forward to the council before it is discussed.

So that would be in case if you need a seconder for a motion to be brought to the council. That would exactly mean okay, you need two people. So then the other question is do you need the motion or the seconder before it's going to be decided on, which means there could have been done - could have been some discussion in between?

So if for example the case could be okay, somebody there bring up - come up with a motion, but I'm not really happy with that. I would like - I would ask him before I could support it, I would ask me well about many friendly or whatever kind of amendments.

And then I would be in the case to second it or to support it. So this is I think the question we should discuss the pros and cons. I have, you know, an opinion on that. You may have an opinion and others as well. And we should put all these opinions together and then this is the way how we are going to discuss it. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. And very interesting point. I see also Mary you have your hand up. You have the mic.

Mary Wong: I do. Thank you Wolf - or thank you Rudi. This is Mary Wong from staff. I just wanted to follow up on Wolf-Ulrich's point before him. Certainly this is the current procedure, so two observations perhaps.

The first is that to require a seconder by the time of the deadline for the submission of motion, which is the 10 date deadline, as Julie has noted already. This might create a practical problem because we have found from the staff side that particularly at times where the community and the Council are quite busy and the motion is accompanied by a document, be it an issue report or something that's substantive.

It can take quite a bit of coordination and work to even make it by the 10 day deadline. This should not be a reason for the SCI to not propose that the seconder must be in place by the 10 day deadline. But I thought it might be helpful to offer this observation that it may create a sort of practical burden that could be additional work, but if justified then so be it.

The other point that I wanted to make was that one follow on consequence, which I want to add to my recollection has never happened is that if someone were to propose a motion but someone else on the Council potentially representing a different constituency or stakeholder group were to object to the motion.

And I raise this point because while it's not, you know, specified - none of this is specified as we just said, generally the idea for there to be a seconder of a motion is to avoid action or even available time for discussion being taken by a suggestion or a proposal that really is only one person or one group's position.

And if that is the reason or one of the reasons we're having a second, then I'd say there's two conflicts. One is that, you know, the seconder must be from a different constituency or stakeholder group. And that would be something that, you know, in the documentation and in the visual diagram that the staff will prepare that that makes clear, you know, to avoid that problem.

But that secondly, you know, instead of requiring a seconder the SCI or this sub-team at least, initially could consider whether you want to discuss some of the, you know, possible I guess consequences.

One being that, you know, somebody could object that the motion as proposed is, you know, not something that the Council should be acting on. And that obviously would be a different route than saying there must be a seconder, but it might accomplish the same purpose.

I hope I'm making sense because it's kind of 2:30 in the morning. And so I'm sure people will stop me if I'm saying things nobody understands. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: No thank you very much Mary. I think it seems quite clear. And it's not easy material that we are taking care of. It's quite complex to embrace all the possible situations that can happen.

And I was just maybe inventing one that helps me convincing myself that the seconder could be quite important. When you have a motion that was brought up on the mailing list and there was no seconder, there could be another motion made on the same topic that is brought to the list and get a seconder on the list and moves on to the agenda of the Council both moving on to the agenda of the Council.

Would the Council consider the one having a seconder being - having priority on the first one? That's even a question that I'm getting on my radar here. But I don't want to make it too complex. Let's first try to see if the process as it stands today, the step for 1, 2 and 3 we - if we feel there is need for clarification, then I think we should put that on our action list for between now and the next call.

So that on the next call we have the time to explore with colleagues to see if we can go in that way - in that direction. And have eventually evaluated or possible other key concerns that could happen so that there really quite -

sorry, clear guidance for councilors and for the Council itself to work on when things are happening.

And so that people can say okay, this is for the work and this the way we need to proceed. So I think that the first issue that we have on the list is the pros and the cons of having a deadline for seconders. And perhaps also consider immediate if the motion is a seconder has priority on a motion without a seconder because that could make things change in the process during the meeting - the Council meeting itself.

And there is a version of a motion. And the motion can - is voted first and approved, goes through, it could be that the second person gets killed by the fact that the first motion got voted. Just to consider some circumstances where things can go in a bad way if there is not clear guidance, to me at least, it would make my life difficult being on the Council to define okay, do I have to first vote on the second one in my head?

And then consider okay, I cannot vote on the first one. Just to give you some samples that I know that even in the evening I'm getting confused by all these difficult cases that we can have. But I would like to hear from others like Angie and (Sara). Do you have any opinions, remarks, ideas on the steps that we should go through on the definition we have in front of us, Step 1, 2 and 3 of the process? Yes Angie, you have the mic. I don't know if you have been unmuted. We can't hear you.

Angie Graves: Okay, thank you for your patience. This is Angie, Angie Graves and thank you for asking. As for me, I'm learning as much as anything listening to you and Wolf-Ulrich and Julie as well.

And I hope to learn enough to be a contributor. Right now I'm probably less of a contributor and more of a learner. My apologies for that, but do not have any comments. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Angie. And well we all learn. You know, we are in the process of things are not clear, so we are all learning and trying to find a way through all of these difficulties with and without experience. Both are required. Sometimes fresh, new views can help getting as out of a very old misery. I see (Marie) you have your hand up. You have the mic. That was old. Okay, no problem. So I don't know if (Sara) you have any opinions on this? You have the mic.

Sara Bockey: Okay sure. I guess I have just one clarification I'm looking for regarding the deadline to the seconders. So I'm new to all of this. It's just a matter of my ignorance and not being completely familiarized with the process.

So are there instances when you would have a motion that does not get seconded that goes on to a vote? Or would we want to require at least a second prior to the vote or motion?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you (Sara). Well, I can give you an answer on that immediately, really for the transcript. When you read Step 1, the proposers can certainly request that there is a motion - that the motion be seconded by another councilor. So there is a case where, of course a seconder is required.

Sara Bockey: Right, but if someone did not expressly request it be seconded and they just put forth a motion, would it proceed to a vote without having it seconded if it know what seconded it? I guess that's my question. Or is it a requirement that anything has to have - any motion has to have a second prior to going to vote?

Rudi Vansnick: Well if you - as Mary Wong was mentioning in the chat also, when you go to Step 4, the motion is discussed at the council meeting. So that's where the motion will be voted. There is no seconder requested.

The motion proceeds to a vote only if it has been seconded by a GNSO Councilor. So there is a need for a seconder as far as I understand from that sentence.

Sara Bockey: Okay. That's very helpful. And that was my only question when I read through it. But just it's sticking in my head for some reason.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes no problem. No problem. It's good to have (unintelligible) all of us on - there are only four or five sentences in front of us and you see how much difficulties we have to have a clear understanding of what is needed and how the things are going on. The four or five sentences probably should become perhaps double, 10 sentences in order to have clearance on the understanding of what's in front of us.

And I'm reading in the chat the motion needs a seconder but is not fixed in the procedures. Well that's a good point Wolf-Ulrich. If it's not in the procedures, then it should at least be written in the procedures that voting can only happen if there is a seconder of the motion. I see you have your hand up Wolf-Ulrich. You have the mic.

Wolf-Ulrich Knob: Yes thanks Rudi. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes, I agree. This is the usual case. Well we'll be just with the (unintelligible) moving is deciding on motions then if - in case there is a seconder.

So I'm not sure whether it is fixed in the - or it is mentioned in the procedures. I'm not sure about it or if you can check that. On the other hand, so this is caution and at my own experience, you know, tells me I think for newcomers especially its necessary there to know the reason why - what is it about motions?

You know, it is just - when I came, when I started ICANN saw that. You know, its usual behavior, you know, on board - at the board level in other groups as

well. You know, if it comes to motions and there's a seconder. So that was natural, let me say.

But why is it? So in that case, at least we should put some bullet points together which is also helpful for people who come, who join the table newly. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. And yes, for newcomers it's probably very difficult to have - get the right temperature of the discussions right at the first meeting. And I was just wondering, just again a suggestion, a proposal to the group here.

Why should the GNSO Council procedures in motions and voting's be different from other groups in ICANN? Is there not something that we could use as being the most common way it has been done and is done within ICANN to avoid that we have procedures that are different group by group?

While the process itself in a democratic and multi-stakeholder concept should be the same for every department in ICANN. At least that's what I would suppose that would be the case.

And especially with regard to the IANA condition, I think it's quite important that decisions are taken in a way that are common in the whole ICANN structure. I can be wrong. If I'm wrong, please tell me. I don't know. Julie is this something we could eventually have an eye on and see if there is common ground in different departments of ICANN or in different SOs and ACs? And see if we could use eventually good practices and good procedures that exist somewhere else? Julie you have the mic.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, yes Rudi this is Julie Hedlund from staff. I - the very - the practices vary among the SOs and ACs. I can tell you for example for the SSAC, there are in the SSAC operational procedures no mention of any kind of - any procedures relating to motions. There is no such thing as submitting a

motion. There are no procedures related to votes. There are not procedures relating to consensus and how consensus is achieved.

And I know that that is also true for the RSAC. We certainly can look at practices say for the CCNSO because I do not know what form they take there and also for the ALAC. But I would caution that I think we probably cannot expect to have uniform procedures across the various bodies because they do have very different methods of operation.

So I think as a starting point we may want to stick to what works best for the GNSO and the way it operates. And see whether or not there are any issues with the current informal process, which I think may here have noted and staff as well, has worked well.

And perhaps the main issue that was indeed flagged by the GNSO Council when this issue was submitted to the SCI is that while the practice may work well, since it is not codified, there is no one place that councilors and in particular new councilors can turn to determine whether or not there is consistency in the action of the councilors because these are not codified.

And of course it is hard for people to remember from one time to the next, especially new people, exactly how things should be followed if they aren't written down. So I think that the very base the question is do, you know, let us then do a flowchart, right down as many of these procedures and as clearly as we can as possible, the sub-team debates what works and what doesn't and seeks input on that from other councilors and people on the SCI who have been councilors.

Create a flowchart and then, you know, make the recommendation I guess to the full SCI and then to the GNSO Council. Sorry to go on for so long.

Rudi Vansnick: No problem Julie. And thank you very much for this guidance. As we - I'm looking at the clock, we are four minutes to the hour. So we are almost at the end of this first call.

I think indeed we have a good action point that we need to work on for a while to have a really very clear view on the whole process through that flowchart.

And I would propose that for the next meeting we prepare ourselves to go through the different steps and flag off what's okay and eventually see where there are (hick acks) that are stopping us in going through them. And find out if there is any other issue that would need to be taken care of in addition to this first action point.

So then the question is the timing of the next meeting. And we didn't define any deadlines, but I think it's good if we could at least have things done for the next SCI call is beginning of every - if I'm not wrong, I don't have my agenda in front of me, so I'm hesitating now. But maybe Julie you can give me some help here?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. There currently isn't an SCI call scheduled. The idea was that these sub-teams would complete their work. And then that would be fed into the SCI and the SCI would schedule a call accordingly.

I think that the idea was that the SCI would, you know, meet in say mid-February to consider the work of the sub-teams. And so I guess a couple of questions with relating to, you know, to the completion of the chart and time for discussion of the chart.

I am wondering whether or not we, rather than scheduling a meeting next week, if we want to - I mean it will take a little bit of time for staff to do the

chart, and then of course we do want to make sure that people have plenty of time to look at it.

I'm wondering if we should instead of looking at scheduling for next week, perhaps schedule it for that first week in February. Or if we do schedule for next week, perhaps we should try to do a doodle and schedule for later in the week next week. And maybe even see if we can find some times that might work a little better or Mary as well.

The only difficulty there is I know Rudi it would make it conceivably late for you. So we might be somewhat restricted there.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. Well no problem. You know, I can shift hours and it's great to have you all from staff available because otherwise we are we are, I think I got lost in all the documentation and still that we need to take a look at.

I would take on your first approach and say let's have our next meeting around the beginning of February so that we have - you have first the time to work on this flowchart so that you can cover everything. It doesn't make sense to rush and hurry up and just have a flowchart that reflects only 80% of the situation.

So it's preferable having a good overview of it. And have the time with the team offline to have a view or individual views and then eventually go back to our communities too. And then discuss that really thoroughly on the first or the second call of this sub-team, early February. Is that something that can work for everyone?

And again, I consider that silence is acceptance. So I would like to propose that we allow first ICANN staff to work on the flowchart. And send it to the list so that we can go through it. And then have our next call the 2nd of February.

Well if people want to change timing, no problem. Please tell me if for others in the team, later call could be okay for me too. I could say we could do it in 21 or 22 UTC. Perhaps that helps others on this group also to have a better timing.

Wolf-Ulrich you are not available in the first week of February. That's a pity because you have experience as a Councilor. It could help quite a lot. Julie I see you have your hand up. You have the mic.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry. I was on mute. No, I was just going to suggest that we should schedule, if we can, when all of the sub-team members can be on the call. And Wolf-Ulrich does bring very helpful experience as a GNSO Councilor.

And so I'm just wondering if maybe we should do a doodle and see if there was a time perhaps, you know, either - well, I have to say I unfortunately cannot do a call at this time next week on the 26th. And it is a difficult time for Mary.

But perhaps we could shift to say the 28th. I see Wolf-Ulrich's notes. He can contribute until January 26. Wolf-Ulrich if we did a call on the 26th would you be able to join?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, yes. I would be able - possible. Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you very much Wolf-Ulrich. We did hear that. Then Rudi I would suggest that we try for the 26th of January. I would have to coordinate with Mary to see if she would cover - be able to cover that call because I will be in SSAC meetings all day Monday and Tuesday of next week.

And I could certainly get the chart out at I think with, you know, running it by Mary by later this week. I'm sorry. I see I'm running us over time. So perhaps we should then go ahead and keep for the 26th. And we'll try to get the chart out ahead of time and see if that works for everyone.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Wolf-Ulrich speaking, excuse me. On the 26th, would it be possible to do a call - if a call is done, do it earlier? Let me say around 16 UTC?

Julie Hedlund: So 16 UTC. Would that work for you Rudi?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Or even earlier.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead Rudi. Sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Julie, Wolf-Ulrich and Rudi. This is Mary. I was just going to say and, you know, I was just going to check the calendar. I think the rehearsal for the next generation RDA working group, which is the new Whois PDP is schedule for 1600 UTC on Tuesday the 26th.

So from the staff perspective, because of the SSAC meeting, it would - a meeting of this sub-team on Tuesday the 26th probably would be easiest if it was either at this time or if earlier then it would have to be before 1600 UTC. Sorry to be adding more confusion to the mix.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Mary. And well for me, there is no issue at all. If it's earlier, no problem. I'm just looking at the others. Angie and (Sara) does that work for you? I would say eventually at 14 UTC. Angie agrees and (Sara) also. So Wolf-Ulrich is that okay with you too?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes I'm okay.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay so let's schedule that 14 UTC that we'll probably help ICANN staff a little bit in timing for the different calls they have. I'm just wondering if you have enough time to go through the flowchart.

Eventually if it's not fully, fully done we can work on the parts that are clear and that we can handle. I think there is enough discussion that needs to take place. So with that we have the last point. Any other business? I don't know if there is any other business we need to take care of.

I would like to thank you all for your participation in our first call on this sub-team A. I would say enjoy your evening or your night or your morning. And we will reach the mails that will follow this call with the flowchart and all the other stuff. Thank you so much. And we can stop recording.

END