

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Tuesday 17 December 2013 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 17 December 2013 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-201312173-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Ronald Andruff – Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Primary – Chair

Angie Graves - Commercial and Business Users Constituency – Alternate

Ken Bour – guest speaker

Jennifer Wolfe – NCA primary

Amr Elsadr – NCUC Alternate

Greg Shatan – IPC – Alternate

Cintra Sooknanan – NPOC Alternate

Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC Primary

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen - ISPCP

Thomas Rickert – NCA Alternate

Apologies:

Avri Doria – Non Commercial SG – Primary – Vice-Chair

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund

Mary Wong

Glen de Saint Géry

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much (Tanya). Shall I do a role call for you (Ron)?

Ron Androff: Please madam. Thank you very much.

Glen DeSaintgery: Pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the SCI call on the 17 of December. And on the call we have (Sentra Sukanenan), Jennifer Wolfe, Wolf-Ulrich Knobon, Ken Bour, Ron Androff, our Chair, Angie Graves, and Thomas Rickert.

For staff we have Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, and myself, Glen DeSaintgery.

We have apologies from Avery. And on the Adobe Connect Room we have (Marinlaw Leminuer) who is not on the bridge. And I do not see anyone else.

Julie Hedlund: Glen, (Marie Lure) has requested a dial-out. She's going to send you a note.

Glen DeSaintgery: Pleasure. I'll do that. Thank you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: And may I ask you please or remind you to say your name before you speak for transcription purposes. Thank you, and over to you Ron.

Ron Androff: Thank you very much Glen. This is Ron Androff from the BC and Chair of the SCI for the record. Lovely to see everyone on the list, and particularly as we are right around the corner from the holiday season. So thank you for making time today everyone to come on and do some of our busy work.

So the first item on the agenda after the roll call was statements of interest. So I'll ask if anyone has had any changes since we last met to their statements of interest. Hearing none we'll move on to the next item.

And the next item on the list is the approval of the agenda. So the agenda here is on the Adobe Connect Room on the right hand side of the screen. It was sent out earlier so I trust that you've all seen it, and would ask if anyone has any comments about the agenda or would like to add anything to AOB, any other business at this time.

All right then. Hearing none we'll now state that the agenda has been approved and we'll move on to Item number 4 which is the Chair and Vice-Chair elections. And on the screen what you're seeing is the - I believe the charter elements of what our Vice-Chair and Chair elections call for.

Information was circulated by Julie and I'm grateful for that and for having sent around all of the information with regard to the elections and how things will proceed. I had noted that I would be happy to stay on as your Chair for another year which would then bring me to the end of my term or my term limit.

And (Aubrey) - she had so many other activities on her table and is now our new liaison to the GSO Council has affirmed that she will not be running. So I would perhaps turn to Julie to ask if there's been some Vice-Chair nominations as well as Chair nominations going forward. Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Ron. This is Julie Hedlund. I have seen no nominations for Chair or Vice-Chair on the list. I haven't received any others otherwise. I would ask Glen - has anybody in the secretariat noted any nominations for Chair or Vice-Chair that I may have missed?

Glen DeSaintgery: No, I have not seen any Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: The only thing that I have seen is that Mikey O'Connor has resigned from the group.

Ron Androff: Thank you Glen. In fact I was going to speak to both - speak to Mikey in a moment. But speaking with regard to the election Julie, is there anything I left off in my introduction of the election that might be important that I've - that should be included in the record?

Julie Hudlund: Not that can I can see. As you all note on the Adobe Connect - the Chair has the option of announcing intention to stay on as Chair if his or her term - if he or she is not term limited which Ron is not. And as Ron noted, (Aubrey) has stepped down from Vice-Chair. I have not seen any other volunteers or nominations for Chair or for Vice-Chair.

So if there are none, according to the procedures, if there is only candidate for either position there would be no need for an election. But I think that there would still be desire to have members of the SCI affirm, you know, the Chair. In this case it would be Ron in that position if there are no other volunteers.

If there are no volunteers for Vice-Chair there would be no need for an election there. If there is one volunteer then we would ask I think the SCI to affirm that that person would be Vice-Chair.

Ron Androff: So let me ask one question. We have a - I'm just seeing the Adobe Connect Room and I'm seeing where about six or seven, eight people from the committee. Do we have enough people on the call to make this determination?

Julie Hedlund: I don't think that the procedures speak to that Ron. This is Julie. But I see that Mary has her hand up.

Ron Androff: Yes, thank you. Mary, please go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thank you Ron. Thank you Julie. And I'm not going to have a specific answer, but Ron as you note there are a number of people on the call. I just wonder if it might be easier for the SCI to as Julie said affirm things, perhaps if not today then say by the end of the week to confirm perhaps either yourself as Chair or to come as a nominee at least for Vice-Chair.

And I don't know if anyone on the call wants to speak to that as to whether or not they would need to consult with the groups that they represent and whether they've done so or not. But I do think that perhaps it would be helpful to have a date set for when you want to formally close nominations on the understanding that each representative has the proper instruction from his or her group should they be representing one on this committee.

Ron Androff: Thank you Mary. I see Wolf-Ulrich and then I have a comment. I'll put myself in the queue. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking with regards to the Chair election. So I would suggest we just have one candidate so it's one standing again. So we could go forward today and ask for confirmation. I think that would be one step. So to be firm that the seat can continue for that. That would be my proposal.

With regard to Vice-Chair my proposal would be well to ask, you know, since SCI is reflecting the GSNO structure in having all stakeholder groups available as first and second members here. Then one is one member representing the commercial stakeholder group here.

So I would like to see if that is possible to find a Vice-Chair from another stakeholder group which is not - the words are not saying that in that direction. But it would be good from my point of view to have one - somebody from another stakeholder group. Thank you.

Ron Androff: Thank you Wolf. You took the words right out of my mouth. That was my - so I was next in the queue and was about to say exactly that. I think that if we could - I think we can all agree then that there's one candidate for the chair. And if we can affirm that as Mary suggested, that would be good. That's one step.

But the second step is probably more important and it has to do with balance. And I agree with everything you've just said Wolf-Ulrich so I support that idea - someone coming from the noncommercial stakeholder group is possible.

(Sentra), please - you're recognized.

(Sentra Sukanenan): Thank you Ron. This is (Sentra). If there's no difficulty with an alternate representative being the Vice-Chair of the Working Group, I would like to put my name forward for the Vice-Chair position. I am the alternate representative from the N Park which is part of the NCSG. Thank you.

Ron Androff: Thank you (Sentra). For some reason I've fallen off the Adobe and I'm going to get back on. But perhaps Julie can guide me in my blindness. Is there - are there other people who like to speak?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Ron, I also was kicked off. Others may have been as well. So I think that was just a general fault with the Adobe Connect. I'm just letting people back on right now. I see it also kicked off several people. So people are just gradually getting back into the room.

Ron Androff: Okay. Thank you. Thank you (Sentra) for putting your name forward. The other one of the - I would just also like to point out that we have Jennifer Wolfe who is a non-com appointee. And Jennifer would be - I'm sorry, I'm hearing echo - one second.

Okay. My speakers are muted. And Jennifer Wolfe as a noncom appointee, I'm not sure if she has an ability to participate or not. Mary, I see your hand is up.

Mary Wong: Yes Ron. And first let me clarify that obviously I wasn't trying to hold things up with my earlier comment. I just wanted to be sure that in all cases that when the SCI's comfortable with moving forward with an affirmation or an election as the case may be that they're representing

specific constituencies of stakeholder groups that that is something that they are comfortable with as a representative of that group.

Secondly as to balance, I guess you could achieve balance a couple of ways. I think one perspective is that from the commercial stakeholder group those are representatives of business interests as are contracted parties. And that would argue for a Vice-Chair hopefully from the noncommercial stakeholder group at the same time. We could also look at balance as between the two houses, contracted and non-contracted. Again I say that just to not discourage anybody.

Thirdly with respect to (Sentra)'s comment, the charter here speaks to primary members rather than alternates being eligible to run for a Chair or a Vice-Chair position. I don't believe that there is a language there about waivers, but it may be that should the SCI wish to waive that ruling in any one instance that that may be something that you can request of the Council. But as it stands I believe the charter is somewhat clear in that regard.

Ron Androff: That's helpful. Thank you very much Mary. So I think that just to move this on - we have a lot of other topics we want to cover during this call. If we could, having heard what Mary said, and if the members agree then I would suggest that we would ask for an affirmation of the Chair at this moment to continue and that checks that box. And then we would look to invite members to one last call for nominations.

And if we don't see other nominations, then we might indeed look to get a charter revision even though we just finished it from the Council to allow (Sentra) to take up that position as she's expressed an interest

to do so. Is there anyone that feels contrary to what I've just suggested?

Mary, I see your hand - please.

Mary: Yes, Ron. Thank you. And I've tried to wait for a brief period, so I apologize if I'm repeating what you just said. Just to clarify, so if you keep the nomination period for Vice-Chair open for a certain period, and then if there's no other nominations, the SCI would ask the Council to agree to appoint an alternate as Vice-Chair for the next year. Did I get that right?

Ron Androff: That's where I was going with it, exactly - that we have a volunteer but our current charter does not allow for that individual so we will be asking for a waiver.

So having said that then, so I'm not sure. I think I need to step aside to allow the affirmation to happen. This is such a procedural element. I'm out of my - Ken, perhaps Mary or Glen could explain how we go forward for this affirmation of the Chair.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Since there is no language in the charter, I think we could simply ask people to use the up or down button, the checkmark button if they are affirming if they are in the Adobe Connect Room. We're all I think a little bit out of water on this since there is no language to speak to it in the charter. But I know in other cases simply having people affirm either verbally or using the checkmark would be one way to do it. I don't know Mary, if you have anything you want to add or Glen.

Ron Androff: Let's do it. Thank you Julie. Okay, so then let's do that then. I'd ask anyone who is - who would like to confirm that I stay in the Chair please use the checkmark and those that would rather I not use the X mark.

All right. Thank you all very much for your gracious support and I will...

Thomas Rickert: Ron?

Ron Androff: Yes, please.

Thomas Rickert: Ron, this is Thomas. I just wanted to let you know that if I were an alternate and if I had the opportunity to say yes to you, I would have done so.

Ron Androff: Well thank you Thomas. You're very kind - very gracious. Thank you all. And so we checked that. That's behind us. And then we will look - we've got this Christmas week upon us but...

Julie Hedlund: Ron, excuse me. This is Julie Hedlund. I'm sorry. I see that Greg Shatan just joined the Adobe Connect Room. Greg, are you also on the teleconference?

I just didn't know if he wanted an opportunity to also add his checkmark. But I don't think that that's necessarily - procedurally necessary, but just noted that he joined.

Ron Androff: Thank you Julie. If Greg would like me to step down he's welcome to write in to the Chat box step down. But I think we have a large enough number to go forward. So let's do that.

And now I was starting to say what's this - we're now on Tuesday just before Christmas. And I'm not sure how many people's attention we're going to get now regarding this election. But if everyone is in agreement with this idea that by Friday of this week we'll ask Julie to send out a message in capital letters in the subject line - please confirm that you are in agreement to have (Sentra) participate as the Vice-Chair if no other primary candidate steps forward between now and Friday.

And if we were to do that, then if another candidate steps forward that was a primary and was only one, then they would be affirmed on our next call. If in fact there were two, we would be holding an election before our next call. Does anyone have any disagreement with that? (Sentra), please go ahead.

(Sentra Sukanenan): Thanks Ron. This is (Sentra). There was a bit of discussion as there being balance with regard to the CSG and the non-contracted or (unintelligible) be part of that message going out. That preference (unintelligible) who come from the other side.

Ron Androff: That would be - I think in the explanation Julie could note that the members - during the call the members supported the idea of a balanced approach. However there's nothing in the charter or the bylaws that forced us to go that way but we did support that that way forward. I think that's a very good idea.

And thank you Mary for noting in the Chat that the next Council meeting is on the 23rd of January. I would think that our meeting would be approximately a week or so before and maybe earlier - we'll sort

that out. But if that's the case that would give us the opportunity then to go to Council to get that approved.

Great. All right then. If everyone's in agreement with that we'll move on to the next element. And our dear friend Ken Bour who's been working very hard on our self-assessment is on the call. And Ken, I would like to throw the talking stick to you my friend. Please.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Thank you very much Ron. Everyone can hear me all right?

Ron Androff: Yes, we can hear you.

Ken Bour: Okay, thank you - just wanted anybody to say something. I think that I only have just a very short comment. We were asked to recalibrate, reset the Working Group self-assessment questionnaire and redo it as though it had not been done before. And so I set it up that way. Mikey I believe sent a message to all of the members of the team. And I can report to you that as of right this second there have been two completed responses.

The second element was to see if we could get more feedback from individuals about the process itself rather than commenting about the effectiveness of the Working Group itself. And on the matter of the feedback we did get one additional comment. It's short - I'll just read it.

And it's public so it's - it came from Omar. I agree with Tim. Tim Ruiz had also submitted a prior comment which basically said he thought that the survey was fine. Omar said I agree with Tim. I added comments but only to elaborate my choices and answers. All in all I

believe that these questions if answered regularly following the conclusion of the work of every group should provide a fine assessment of the inputs, outputs, participation of the Working Group members.

The questions were clear and easy to answer and took very little time to go through (perand) about 20 minutes including comments. Ron, that's all I have to report unfortunately at the moment.

Ron Androff: Well that's fine Ken. I know for those who are relatively new to the SCI, we have been working on this for some time and it's actually was tested with Mikey's working group in a period when they had quite a bit of work on the table. But we did have a number of responses. And then we went back and said would you just go back one more time and give us some more responses.

I almost take the lack of response as a sign that the form itself and the work that's been done is sufficient. Often people just get very busy. And if they have something to complain about they're the first ones to start writing an email. But if you're not hearing any complaints I think that we're moving in the right direction.

So for my part I'm very pleased with the work that you've done and Mikey being the ultimate Working Group member. And I mentioned earlier - it was mentioned earlier that he's now left the SCI because of all of his other commitments. I would just like to say a public thank you to him for the record because he was and continues to be a very diligent worker in the labor team of ICANN.

But he was very pleased with this working group's self-assessment and he's a guy that's a real stickler. I myself was as well. And I think we're at a point where if we all agree, we can send this over to the GNSO Council and say we've gotten this assessment. We would like to see this assessment included at the time that a working group is chartered so that it will actually undertake this activity simultaneous to the work they're doing.

And what it is is a real measurement of the quality of the working group, the quality of the chairmanship of the working group and the quality of the output from the working group. And the idea is really to give ICANN and the community at large a better set of metrics as to how well we're doing at our jobs.

We're now 15 years old, so I think of it as a 15 year old child - not quite ready to drive the car but pretty well, you know, standing on his own two feet. So if there's no exception - if there's no - well let me throw open the floor for some discussion about this before I suggest we send it on. So please, anyone has comments or thoughts? Bring them to the table now. Omar, please.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks Ron. This is Omar. You kind of mentioned it. But when the requests for to fill out the self-assessment had originally gone to the Working Group that was in a bit of a strange time for the Working Group and it was unlikely that anyone would fill it out then.

And then when it went back for a second time the requests to fill out a self-assessment for the Working Group I guess folks had pretty much moved on and probably to other working groups and more work. I agree with you that it's a relatively good indicator if you are interested

in delaying conveying this message to the Council a little bit longer, we could try to get a few more responses.

I can't promise that you will get any. But I was a member of this working group as well and I really would have liked to see more people fill out the assessment. I think it was a really good one and I would have liked to get some positive feedback on it. But I leave it to everyone else to decide. Thanks.

Ron Androff: Thanks Omar. Anyone else have some comments or thoughts, particularly on whether we should ship this over to the GNSO Council? I assume at that point they will do their own work. The Council will do its own work with regard to be satisfied or tailoring it in a way that they would be more satisfied with it.

So Ken, you may well have more conference calls on this with the Council. Julie, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Ron. This is Julie Hedlund. I think that one thing that this group will need to consider when this is sent to the Council is that I believe that the working group guidelines would have to be modified to include language about the requirement for taking this survey when a working group completes its work.

Right now there's no language in the guidelines that, you know, pertain specifically to this survey or to, you know, taking this particular assessment. So I think that there will probably have to be a marked up version of the guidelines that the SCI would look at and agree that that language is acceptable.

And then probably the whole package would go over to the Council along with a motion that whereby the, you know, the Council would approve the survey and also the accompanying changes to the working group guidelines pertaining to the survey.

So I think there's actually perhaps a bit more work that needs to be done on this. And the other thing that I would mention is I guess I would agree with Omar that it would be nice if we could get a few more responses to this survey now that people are done with the work.

And I also might suggest that given that the survey notice went out to people just before the start of, you know, the busyness of the holidays it might be worthwhile giving people, you know, a chance to respond after the holiday rush. But of course I'll defer to the SCI members on that matter.

Ken Bour: Hey Ron, this is Ken. I'd like to address a few of those points whenever it's convenient.

Ron Androff: Please Ken, take the floor.

Ken Bour: Okay, great. Yes, Julie is absolutely right. But she might not be remembering - this is a long time ago - I actually did go through the GNSO operating procedures and the working group guidelines. I marked up all of the language and I made a recommendation to the SCI as to how this would all be packaged to give to the Council.

That was a while ago and that's in the archives or in the back drop of our list. So I can certainly find that message, drag it back out and put it so that it's up at the top. My recommendation would be that in the

package to the Council, in addition to the language changes to the working group guidelines and the GNSO operating procedures, and they are, you know, redlined, we would give them the report that I already created, not so much to be thought of as this is the definitive thinking of the working group members of the Thick Who Is Group.

But it is - we did ask that group for opinions. Eight people did respond in the first iteration. We did analyze and summarize those results. And they do give you a picture, a framework, an understanding of what this would look like going forward had the timing been better. But at least it gives you a picture of what this would look like in the implementation phase.

I'm not - I don't think it's useful at this point to just keep asking the Thick Who Is Group repetitively to keep filling out the survey. We gave it one last try. We got two. At this point I would say it's probably not a good idea to just keep hammering that group at this point. Those are my thoughts on the subject.

Ron Androff: Thank you Ken. And thank you for reminding us that you had done all of that work in the past so we have it at our fingertips. That's excellent.

I'm going to fall on the side of you as well as to share that this is ready to ship. We've tapped that group significantly. And Omar, with respect to your desire and also Julie to see a few more people come in. As Ken said and I believe - and if it hasn't been so, your report Ken should have been circulated to the entire SCI.

I know I saw it. Mikey saw it as the Chair of that group - that working group. But it's quite a detailed report that Ken has mentioned. So Julie,

if we haven't already done that please send out the report that Ken did to the entire - and I see you're saying in the Chat it was already submitted to the entire SCI.

So we've all got it in our mailboxes if you haven't had a chance to read it yet. And I think it's well worth the read. It was some very good analysis of that research as well. And even though it was a very small body, I think that we can all agree that the analysis is pretty solid.

So I'll let Mary and then Omar speak. And then we'll wrap this segment up. Please Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Ron. And not that this should hold anything up, but prior to sending off the suggested amendments to the GNSO Council, one thing that the SCM might want to think about, if you look down the agenda here and the number of potential changes that you may end up suggesting either to the GNSO working group guidelines or perhaps to the GNSO operating procedures is to give the - at least the Chair of the Council or perhaps (unintelligible) liaison some sense of the types of changes - well not the types but the fact that there may be some proposed changes, and to the extent possible packaging them at the same time.

It may not be possible for this particular issue because it sounds like this is pretty much good to go whereas a possible review of the GNSO guidelines consensus levels may take a longer time. But it might I think be helpful to the Council to know, to expect a possible, you know, two amendments to be suggested within this timeframe for example so that it doesn't over the course of the next year appear like the SCI is, you know, sending, you know, three or four potential amendments and

either engendering some sense of confusion or questions as to the timing of some of those submissions. I realize the Council is on this group but I just wanted to raise it as something that to the extent possible the SCI might want to consider doing.

Ron Androff: Good points Mary, and well taken. Omar?

Omar Kaminski: Hi, this is Omar - just one last comment on this. There were if I understand correctly eight entries to the self-assessment prior to Mikey's second round of reminding everyone to fill it out and two more which would make ten. And that's probably more than half of the participants who were regular participants on this working group.

But I was left with a few impressions about this topic in the past. And one is that we also want folks who are not active on the working group to fill this out if possible. And the second is the actual feedback on the self-assessment questionnaire which I felt was a primary target of this whole endeavor at this point. And we only got two of those in total.

So those are just my only thoughts on whether or not we would want to wait for a little bit more. But either way I would be fine. I just wanted to say that. Thanks.

Ron Androff: Thanks for bring that to the table Omar, and it's a very valuable contribution. I think that knowing, you know, on how many times we've asked that particular working group to please respond, please respond, please respond, I'm of like mind with Ken. You know we can't - let's not beat a dead horse. People would have if they wanted to by now.

But what I would say and I think what you're alluding to is very helpful is that when we send this over to Council we might well say that we would like to continue to track or continue to run that part of the self-assessment - that review of the questionnaire itself, the survey itself for the next two or three or four working groups just to make sure that the data that we're - that we anticipate is going to come out of that in fact matches what our anticipation is so that we can refine the document. I think that would be a very valuable contribution to making sure that what we're sending over is applicable.

But I would quickly also add that historically what we had was nothing. So we've got to start somewhere and this is as good a start as any and that's the way to go forward. So thank you Omar for your support of that.

And recognizing that Ken has the documentation ready to go, what I'm going to recommend is that we ask Julie to send around the - all of the motions, the changes, the redline markups that Ken found to the entire committee so that on our next call we can affirm that we're in support of this and are ready to ship it to the Council.

And hopefully we can get it to them early enough for their - if not for the January meeting - if not then they can certainly pick it up at the following meeting, but that would be the way I would like to go. I see Julie's hand. But before I recognize her are there any members have anything to say against what I just suggested or have another idea, please put your hand up. Julie, you're recognized.

Julie Hedlund: So yes, first of all I would like to just ask Ken to go ahead and send to the list what he's prepared since he has it and can find it. I don't know where it is and he's agreed to do that.

The other point I would like to echo again is the point that Mary made. And I want to be more specific about it. In Buenos Aires the GNSO Council specifically asked the SCI to consider packaging and grouping or grouping changes to the GNSO Council operating procedure rather than sending changes, you know, here's a couple one month. Here's some more in another couple of months and so on.

Because every time there are changes to the GNSO Council operating procedures, you know, those changes have to go out for public comment that, you know, and there may be then reply comments and so on. And, you know, that takes a couple of months depending.

And also, you know, it might just be a little less fatiguing on, you know, on the Council and on the public in general and perhaps a little bit more consistent to take, you know, to wait until there are, you know, a number of changes that are teed up and provide them all together to the Council. And I'll note that I'm resubmitting a motion.

We've got some significant language that will now go to that, you know, constituencies that stakeholder groups have been looking at that may be very well close to also presenting to the Council. And so the SCI may consider sending a couple of things as a package - both the Working Group guidelines because that is changes to the GNSO Council procedures and maybe the resubmitting a motion if that's close as well. So I just wanted to reemphasize that point.

Ron Androff: Thank you Julie. And I'm in full agreement with that. I think the entire committee probably is because it's quite clear we do not want to see this activity that we're doing this fine tuning continually bog down the Council and force them to do again yet more changes. So I agree with all of that.

I guess what I was suggesting is we send this over and maybe it can't happen in the way I'm seeing it. But I thought we'd send it over so they could actually look at it and see what we're doing and just park it - put it in a box. And then they can take the choice - take the decision, okay we've got enough of these things now. Let's just make these changes.

Because I agree also that the resubmitting of motion which we're going to get into next is probably ready to go after this meeting. But I would be loathed to kind of stack stuff up on our side, then ship it all over and then they've got to deal with all of it. I'd prefer if we could send it over kind of piece by piece saying you pick the time. Maybe it's June that you're going to implement all these things. That's fine but we're going to do our work. We're going to hand them off to you.

Some of the things that we do also have to go out for public comment from time to time, and I'm not sure which of those is that. So asking Staff, is there any reason why we couldn't send this over to them and let them know that they then can collect these things and change the operating procedures as and when they are ready?

Isn't our job just to work these things through and then hand them back and then they take that decision? Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Actually Ron, I need to look back at the procedures. But I'm pretty sure that - and Wolf-Ulrich can correct me if I'm wrong - that the SCI has the ability to send out the suggested changes to the operating procedures for public comment, collective comments, and then package everything up to go to the Council.

It's been a while since we've done some of these changes. I think it was in June was the last time that there were changes to the operating procedures. And I'll take the action to check on how that was done. But I think that the SCI can do this, in which case there would be a step prior to sending these things to the Council and that is that the SCI would redline multiple changes to the operating procedures.

These might apply then to the working group self-assessment, and then maybe also resubmitting a motion. Send that out for public comment, get those comments back, maybe amend those changes as necessary and then send a package on the Council.

Ron Androff: That's a very helpful clarification. Perfect. So that's how we'll do it then. This item as we stand today is ready to go. We're going to - we'll bring it back on the table on our January call and hopefully we'll bring it on the table with our next item.

So with that I'm going to close this out and we move on then in on agenda to the very next item and that is resubmitting a motion. Greg has joined the call. Thank you Greg for getting on board and I'll turn this over to you my friend.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. I think the last that I think happened was that on December 4 after our December 3 meeting I sent around a revised version of the

addressing the resubmission of a motion document. I don't think there were actually any comments other than one from Jen Wolfe that she thought - said this looks really good and accurately captures what was discussed.

Ron Androff: Thank you Greg. And I can tell you that I've - we've taken it internally to the BC and we have also got positive feedback from there. Is there anyone on the call that is - has anything opposed to what we've addressed - what we're suggesting is the proposed rule to address resubmission of a motion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ron, can I speak - I know on the Adobe you were speaking.

Ron Androff: No, please go ahead Wolf-Ulrich. You have the floor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Greg, thanks very much for the text and also from the ISP. It's important (unintelligible).

Ron Androff: Wolf, hold it. Wolf, something's gone wrong with your speaker. Sorry, you went all muffled there. Will you try again?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Can you hear me?

Ron Androff: Much better. That's it. Thank you. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich: Okay. I was just checking again the document just before the meeting and I wonder whether (unintelligible) I found. We were discussing last time the word table - was tabled instead of deferred I think. So I couldn't find that. Did you change that from one tabled to a deferred? Was there a certain reason from your side?

Greg Shatan: If you look at the document that I sent December 4 which says I have attached a clean and tracked changes version of the revised proposal on the resubmission of a motion reflecting yesterday's discussion. If you see that email the word tabled was changed to deferred.

Ron Androff: Okay. Under B4, Limitations and Exceptions under B4, that's specifically what we're talking about. And Wolf I'm seeing it because it was deferred or withdrawn. And it was tabled - it's been removed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So that makes sense, okay. Because I couldn't find it in my document so maybe I missed that. Thanks very much.

Greg Shatan: I'll resend this list just in case it's gotten, you know, submerged somewhere.

Ron Androff: Thank you Greg. So then again if I see no one objecting to the fact that we can put this one in the same box as we just put the working group self-assessment and that is ready to go. And we'll now take the next steps to implement that. Anyone opposed?

Thank you, Greg, and also to all of your colleagues in the ISC for doing this good work. Julie, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

Julie Hudlund: So Ron, it's not clear to me and perhaps I've missed it. I know Greg sent the language around to the list. I know that you requested that people circulate this language in their stakeholder group's constituencies. Do we have confirmation from everyone that their groups have accepted this language?

Ron Androff: So maybe we could have a show of hands that we support. Jennifer has dropped off the call but everyone else is here. A show of hands is your constituency in agreement with this language?

I see Greg has his hand up and as with the BC's.

Wolf-Ulrich: I'm not on the Adobe what we were speaking. But I can confirm.

Ron Androff: Very good. All right. All constituencies are not represented. The registries and registrars are here. And Thomas, that's you if I'm not mistaken. And registries are missing but I think we've got enough confirmation of this to take it forward.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I'm sorry, I should raise my hand. But do we not need to have full consensus to bring something forward - that is we would need to have at least no objections from the registries? Should we reach out to our registry rep?

Ron Androff: I'm as frustrated I think as you are Julie that registries choose not to participate. And I'm inclined to agree with you that we should get their approval on this. So if you could send out a message to them specifically costing the rest of the group saying could you please confirm that you are good to go with this language and all of the constituencies have confirmed that we cannot move forward until you do so.

Greg Shatan: I'm not open to Chat. This is Greg Shatan, and Thomas notes that he is actually not the registrar rep, he's NCA.

Ron Androff: Right. I see that also. Thank you, Greg. And so just to make that point clear Julie, if you could please be very specific that we have full agreement from all of the other constituencies and they were lacking - theirs are lacking and we need to have that so we can move forward.

Omar and then Mary - Omar please.

Julie Hedlund: Actually though, let me just speak to that quickly Ron. So our registrar representatives are James Bladel and (Jennifer Standiford). I have not heard from either of them that the registrars have accepted this. So I will need also to go to them.

Ron Androff: Thank you very much. And actually I wanted just to before - Omar, pardon me for stepping back in. (Marie Laray) asked a very good question. And she says I'm new. Are we representing our constituency and as such our approval is enough or do we need to consult our members each time?

The answer is for our part - Angie Graves and I are the representatives for the BC. And what our job here is to try to use common sense and knowing that - how the BC is guided by its charter and by its bylaws, to fulfill that exercise. We do not take back everything that we discuss here to the SCI.

We take back the resolutions and the things that we've been able to resolve. And we also take the active work activities and we invite their - the BC's comments. But when it comes to these various elements that we discuss here, in many cases we do not take it back to the full BC because we deem it to be something that is our responsibility to resolve on behalf of the constituency.

However each one here is guided by different rules. And the IT constituency are very specific about this. So Ann and Greg were very diligent in taking everything back to that constituency on this particular element. So that's my understanding (Marie Laray).

Omar, please go ahead.

Omar Kaminski: This is all. I just wanted to point out that apart from the registries that noncommercial stakeholders with results are not represented on this call. We have primary reps for the NCSG as well as two primary reps for each of the constituencies. So although (Aubrey) did send the note out on the NCSG list there was no one - there were no objections to this at all. I just thought for the sake of procedure probably should have her confirmation as well. Thanks.

Ron Androff: Thanks Omar. And Julie I'm sure we'll note that. Mary, please go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks Ron and thanks everybody - just two quick points. First about the confirmation and as Julie notes, full consensus currently is still required. So if I could also suggest that in addition to reaching out specifically to the registry and registrar representatives that a note be sent to the whole mailing list - really one of those notes that basically say, you know, please let us know if you have an objection by a date set. And this was basically - the safety a consensus call to the mailing list. That might be helpful for recording purposes if nothing else.

And then secondly with (Maria Laray) with your question. I think as Ron said (unintelligible) have shown, that does depend on each

constituency and stakeholder group how it's chartered and what its operating principals are.

Ron Androff: Thank you Mary. So I'm going to recommend that we put a date certain of January 8. That will allow people to have this time during the Christmas period but after the New year to get back to us post haste on this matter. And so Julie, if you could use the date certain of January 8 which is a Wednesday for anyone who is opposed to this going forward to the Council and all the processes that we described. Thank you.

We're coming up on three minutes before the hour. Waiver exception is the next item and then the voting by email. I apologize, but I am at a loss who was responsible for the waiver exception discussion when we assigned that? I think (Aubrey) might have been one person on that group as well. Does anyone know who we assigned that to in BA?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. So for the waiver exception I don't have an indication of who is running that particular item. For the voting by email (Aubrey) and Thomas were working on an approach and Thomas sent some language prior to this call.

Oh I see that Omar has noted in the Chat that it's a (Marie), (Laura) and Mikey who are working on that item. That is the waiver exception.

Everyone probably noticed in the Chat - this is Julie Hedlund - that Ron has been dropped from the call. So we'll wait for him to get back on for a moment.

Glen DeSaintgery: Ron should be back on the call now. This is Glen.

Julie Hedlund: Glen, in the Chat he - this is Julie - he said he's still having trouble getting back in. I know he's showing up in the call. Ron, are you on the call?

He has actually asked Wolf-Ulrich Knoben if he can take over the call. Wolf, would you be able to do that? And he also asked that we should set a date for our next meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I'm left for speaking yes. So where we are - here. I was just about to set the date for the next meeting because we are on the hour - at the hour here.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund. I just would note that (Marie Laray) has her hand up. But I think she's also not on the call. They're dialing out to her. Perhaps I can suggest something for the next meeting. If we were going on two weeks - which I think we have tried to do - that of course would put us at the 31st of December which I don't think anybody wants for a meeting time.

Yes, we could make it a party. So we could suggest the 7th or the 14th as possible dates. If we are asking for instance for people to come back with a response on the consensus call for resubmitting a motion on the 8th, then perhaps we would want to defer the SCI meeting to the 14th? Does anybody have any thoughts?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is (Marie) still on the phone (unintelligible).

(Marie Laray): Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Marie, you would like to talk to us?

(Marie Laray): Well hi. Can you hear me?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

(Marie Laray): I don't know whether because we are - is this call supposed to finish at - it's just the one hour call or are we going on?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We're (unintelligible).

(Marie Laray): Because we are two minutes after the hour. I mean it's not my business but if we're going to start talking about, you know, the waiver I don't know whether there will be enough time to do it. The same happened last time actually. Shall we start talking about this or we leave it for the upcoming call? I don't know.

Ron Androff: Hello (Marie Laray) and everyone. The operator got me back on the call. This is Ron. Thank you for your patience. I'm not sure what's going on but I'm back with you now.

(Marie Laray): I'm having the exact same problem as you are. That's weird.

Ron Androff: Well God bless us. No, I'm sorry. It's after the hour so what I wanted to do was to bring this call to a conclusion and recommend we have a - we pick this up, the waiver exception and the voting by email and the new item that's been added. So that's seven, eight and nine on the agenda on our next call.

And I'm also wondering if (Marie Laray), you would like to have someone support you to work on this waiver exception for the operating procedures because I think you're on your own on that one now, correct?

(Marie Laray): Yes. I've been left without my teammate.

Ron Androff: Oh, how unfortunate. How unfortunate. Okay, well listen. Then what we'll do is we'll ask Julie to put out a note to the group asking to get some support for you for that work - that subgroup work. That would be very helpful. So thank you for that.

So I think then what we need to do now is just establish that next meeting. And I thought I heard Julie suggest about the 14th of January. Is there anyone who has a problem with that? I'm thinking it goes like this. As much as I would like to get this stuff to the Council, we won't meet that date because they won't have enough lead time to get it on the agenda I don't believe.

But we've got enough work to do in any case to sort out on our own that they could pick this up in their February call. And so if everyone would agree to that, then I would establish the 14th of January as our next meeting date.

Omar, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Omar Kaminski: Yes. I actually just wanted to ask a question about the waiver before we hang up the call.

Ron Androff: So let's just get the call date established.

Omar Kaminski: All right. Sure. In general I'm fine with the 7th or the 14th - whichever.

Ron Androff: Great. So let's establish the 14th unless anyone has any reason not to. So we've got that done. And then if we could just take a quick minute then Omar to ask your question regarding the waiver exception.

Omar Kaminski: I was hoping - I think I brought this up on the previous call. I was hoping that before we discuss this that a little bit of context could be added as to what the problem is. I remember reading an email from Mikey with a description of an incidence in Bourbon where Jonathon was asking - the GNSO Council was asking for, you know, asking why you need a waiver.

There really was no compass on what the actual situation was there. I just think it would be helpful in assessing how useful it would be. So if that could be provided, I'm not sure who would - maybe somebody from Staff could help out with this. But I would personally appreciate it because it would give me more of an understanding of what it is we're actually talking about. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Hey Omar, this is Julie Hedlund. I just want to note that we did - Staff did prepare a backgrounder on the item that did include information as to how the item came up. I'll resend that and then if, you know, if you have further questions we'll be happy to try to address them.

Ron Androff: Right. I would add to that - thank you Julie and thanks for the question Omar. We had asked - we basically have moved to a new format and it's noted in our charter that when we are asked to look at something that it comes in a specific form. So if you look at our charter you'll see

the questions that are being asked. And Staff now uses that form if you will to prepare and present the issues for the SCI membership to review.

So that's one part. And the second part is that we established in small subgroups two or three people that would actually kind of go off and chew on that subject for a little bit and try to again bring a little more context, a little more deeper thinking to it and then bring that to the group and then we could start working on the results of their (dayshunal) work if I can call it that.

So that's really the way we want to approach it going forward. And I think that will help all of us getting a little bit more meat on the bones when it comes to these things.

So that's it. So with that then ladies and gentlemen, I'm not going to take any more of our time other than to say thank you all very much for the always helpful and good deliberations. It's really - I can't stop saying it but this is one of the nicest committees to work on.

It's real collaborative and I enjoy it immensely. And I would like to then just say before we close the recording to wish everyone a very happy and peaceful and safe holiday period and look forward to picking all of this up again with you in 2014.

So unless there's any other thoughts or comments, please bring them to the table now. Are there any other business?

Hearing none I would say again thank you very much and a very happy birthday to Glen DeSaintgery whenever it may happen in the very near future. All the best everyone. Bye for now. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks Ron. Thanks everybody.

END