

**ICANN
Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting
Thursday 23 July 2015 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the Thursday 23 July 2015 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-23jul15-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Rudi Vansnick – NPOC - Primary
Amr Elsadr – NCUC - Primary
Avri Doria – NCSG – Primary
Lori Schulman – IPC - Alternate
Angie Graves – BC – Primary
Ken Stubbs – RySG - Primary

Apologies:

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary
Jennifer Standiford – RrSG – Primary
Anne Aikman Scalese – IPC – Primary - Chair

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you (Hans). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Standing Committee on Improvements teleconference taking place on Thursday the 23rd of July 2015.

On the call today we have Angie Graves, Avri Doria, Rudi Vansnick, Ken Stubbs, Lori Schulman and Amr Elsadr.

We have apologies from Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Jennifer Standiford and Anne-Aikman-Scalese.

From staff we have Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund and myself Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Terri, Rudi for the transcript. Welcome everybody to this call. As you know Anne could not make it and asked me to chair this call.

And this call will essentially looking to two specific agenda points. The first one of course is looking if there is any changes in the statement of interest or that we know that or we take care of some changes. Are there other any changes in statements of interest?

I'm not hearing one then I would say we can move on to third point of the agenda is the discussion about the overlap of waiver and submissions the discussions that we are already started having in Buenos Aires and even before.

It's essentially based on a text that we have in front of us on the Adobe screen is the text between brackets in blue italics to be more precise.

We received already from Wolf-Ulrich on mail some informational changes that he was pointing to.

The first change he was pointing was about the sentence for the next council meeting in the 3.3.2. But that's as far as I understand it's out of the bracket text although it may be interesting to take notice of that one. He wanted to change it and remove the next, the word next in - before the next council meeting.

I don't know if this is something we want to have a discussion on now and move forward with a request of change. Anyone wants to give some comment on this?

I see Amr you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi. This is Amr. Yes I believe where we left this off is that we do have a few members of the committee who are not in favor of making changes and others who are in favor of making the changes.

So I would say that as a committee right now what we need to do is sort of agree whether to proceed or not.

We could make our arguments. I guess Wolf-Ulrich provided some on list earlier. I think I was one of the ones who was in favor of making changes if we do actually want resubmitted motions to be allowed to be granted waivers to the ten day rule for submission of the resubmitted motions.

I don't want to speak for others but I do think this would be a prudent way for us to start is to sort of make sure we know as a committee what we want to do because as we all know decisions of the SCR made on a full consensus basis. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr. And I see also Ken has his hand up. Ken you have the floor.

Ken Stubbs: Thank you very much. I'm actually going to call Avri's experience and because she's managed the council as well.

Avri from a practical standpoint can you tell me what you feel the most comfortable with and explain why you're more comfortable with it? Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Ken. Well I would maybe prefer that Avri- as was that question before I give the floor to Lori. Avri you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. First of all I mean it has been a long time did manage the council and it was a very different one.

But basically I think that the general position I start from is there has to be a really good reason to change the rule.

So when I look at this I'm not sure that I see that good reason because when we're looking at a resubmitted motion what - we're looking at something that it's not a surprise. There's nothing - there's not emergency that needs to be dealt with.

And that the intention of that rule -- I want to make sure I got all this straight -- is that, you know, that there's something that there's pressure, there's a scheduled problem that we have to meet to waive the rule.

And when it's a resubmitted motion I don't know that we have that.

So given that I've basically taken the position that there's no strong reason that we should change the rule and that it complicates things somewhat to change it so that's why I've opted for not doing so at this point. I haven't been convinced that we need to do this. Thanks.

Ken Stubbs: Thanks Avri because I'm - that's how I was leaning. And all you've done is reinforce a position that I was frankly comfortable with as well. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Avri, thank you Ken and Rudi for the transcript. And Lori I don't know if you have something to bring up now. I saw your hand was up.

Perhaps Lori has some - she has some audio problems. Maybe you can have a dial out get on this call. I see Amr's hand is up. Amr you have the floor.

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me now?

Rudi Vansnick: Lori yes we hear you.

Lori Schulman: Okay. Yes I didn't click on something obviously.

All I wanted to say is I guess I'm confused in that I thought we had consensus that there would be a reason to waive the rule and then in BA Avri had raised a point and maybe a few others that perhaps there isn't a reason to raise - waive the rule.

And so I guess I'm a little unclear about context at this point. To what Avri just said is there's no sort of compelling reason why we would raise the rule why didn't we come to that conclusion earlier?

I'm just a little confused as to how we got some consensus on waiving the rule to now it sounds like we're leaning toward not waiving the rule if that makes any sense.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Lori. Yes indeed it's a question that as I was putting forward I tried to make it simple in pronouncing it yes or no. But it looks like it's not that easy.

And I would like to give the floor to Amr again. He has his hand up and he would maybe clarify the other reason.

Amr you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Oh, thanks Rudi and thank you Lori. Yes I think Avri has a point in when she says that this may be unnecessary. I think in the past what - I mean the projects that the SCI has been handed were more about okay we faced this problem on council and it's sort of because of some sort of rule in the operating procedures that doesn't allow the GNSO council to have the flexibility to deal with a certain issue as it comes up.

So as a council as a chartering organization for the SCI we're going to send them this issue and see if they can work it out and see if they can come up with some sort of solution that helps us out and that the stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO can reach consensus on from a procedural perspective.

So in that context we've actually never had an incident where a resubmitted motion or the - or a counselor trying to resubmit a motion has needed to do this beyond the regular ten day rule, the ten day deadline for prior to a council meeting where that would be necessary.

But where this project actually comes from is because when we were asked to set up a rule for the ten day - for waiver to the ten day rule as well as a separate project which deals with resubmitted motions we work on them separately and each one has been addressed in a different section of the operating procedures.

And the way it's set up is that resubmitted motions don't get the same benefit of a waiver in the event that it should become necessary. And then I stress again this has never come up before. It's never happened but the need has never risen before.

But we also discussed whether we would want that or not. Does it make sense as a resubmitted motion? I mean it should also be allowed a waiver to the then ten day rule assuming that both the requirements of the waiver to the rule and requirements of resubmitting a motion are both met?

And the way I see it is yes why not? I mean okay, it's never come up before. It may come up in the future. I think it would - it doesn't hurt to make sure that this sort of flexibility is granted so that if it ever comes up the process, the procedural rules don't sort of stand in the way as opposed to waiting for this to become a problem before having to sort of deal with it.

So that's just a way that I see it. I don't think it's a matter of great urgency. Like I said it's never come up.

The issue of trying to submit a motion past the ten day deadline has come up in the past. Issues on how to resubmit motions have come up in the past but a combination of the two have not.

The way I see it is why not prepare for it? It doesn't hurt anyway, not the way I see it. I mean it doesn't create any problems.

I think that the rules that need to be met in order to have each one of - any one of these scenarios are very clear. And I don't see any potential for problems or gaming in the event that resubmitted motions are allowed to benefit from the waivers of the ten day rule assuming all the rules are met. So that's just the way I see it. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr, Rudi for the transcript.

Well my perception is that the ten days would allow other members of the council to consult their constituencies and their groups and have input on this

except that we know that it's a resubmission so it's something that is already known.

And I'm just wondering if there would be a case where there is such an urgency that the - it would be done beyond the ten days. That's my perception.

But I see Julie's hand up. Julie you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. And I just wanted to note something that Wolf-Ulrich had brought up.

And if you scroll to the second page in the document that's in Adobe Connect room he was saying, you know, I wonder whether it's really - really needs to be formalized in the case of resubmission -- that is the waiver of the ten day rule -- since in every case a former motion shall be the basis for a resubmission.

So I can't really see it happen that the ten day rule can be met which I think is something along the lines of what Avri is saying.

And all - and I do take your point Amr that while this hasn't come up, you know, why not be ready for it to come up.

I think the way Wolf-Ulrich suggested to address that was not to amend the rules but for the first ever contentious case then, you know, seeing whether or not there is a, you know, take that case as a case that the SCI should look at.

So perhaps the consensus at this point might be that we - the SCI could send the message back to the council to say that we don't think this is an urgent or necessary amendment but are happy to review should there be a case, a particularly the contentious case as Wolf-Ulrich appointed to.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie for the clarification and Rudi for the transcript.

And of course it's just still the next council meeting. So anyway if it fails it would be on following council call that the case would be handled.

So it should be only in cases where there is a real big, big urgency. And in the sense of a resubmission I really don't feel that it is that high pressure of urgency that requires that we have to waive the ten day rule. But again it's my personal opinion.

I see Amr's hand up. Amr you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi. This is Amr again. I'm fine with that as long as - and this is the same request I made when I think it was well maybe almost a year ago when we were submitting the SCI findings to the GNSO council on resubmitted motions in general and the ten day waiver rule.

I just I think it would be fine if we do this and we communicate this to council. And I would be happy to support that as long as we make it clear that as is the GNSO offering procedures do not allow for a ten day waiver rules, the ten day waiver rule be applicable to resubmitted motions.

This needs to be very clear so that an attempt by a counselor to apply a - the ten - the waiver to the ten day rule should be done to a resubmitted motion.

I think whatever way we go is fine as long as the GNSO council's aware of what the rules are so that there is no contention on process and let the council sort of focus on what the substance is.

If this becomes a problem in the future and the council does decide to revert this back to SCI if I'm not mistaken - if I understood Wolf-Ulrich's recommendations correctly that's sort of what I got from this.

But yes, the way the operating procedures are right now I think it's very clear that ten day waiver rule is just applicable to resubmitted motions at all. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr. I see Julie's hand up. You have the floor Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Rudi and thanks for that Amr. I just, you know, another alternative might be because there are two issues that the council has asked the SCI to look at right now this particular issue and then also whether or not there needs to be a procedure to address a friendly amendment in motion.

One thing that the SCI could consider to do is to tentatively agree to do the recommendation for the council that you know, as Amr says point out very clearly that the current procedures do not allow the ten day waiver to apply to resubmitted motions but that the SCI would be willing to take this up again in future if there was a particularly, you know, contentious or difficult case but perhaps not than that recommendation now but wait and move on to the friendly amendment issue.

And I don't see any cross over between the two but you never know. It seems whenever we're looking at these procedural changes it's a good idea to sort of look at them holistically.

And then once that issue has been addressed send both recommendations whatever they may be to the council at the same time, just a thought.

And I should mention that Mary was suggesting this as well.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie, Rudi for the transcript.

So I think we are reaching up on a point where we are almost all agreeing that we would inform the council and make a proposal to council.

I'm just wondering if we could ask the council to give us concrete reasons why we should any way review this issue so that we have grounds to discuss.

Because as far as I think you'll know there is no concrete reason or case which requires us to really cut off the discussion and say okay this is what we mean. So that's something that I'm just wondering.

And Amr I see your hand up. You have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks Rudi. This is Amr. I just wanted to note that this - the reason we have this project is not because the GNSO council asked us to look into it. The reason is is because this is something that we as a committee have come up with and this is a conclusion that we have come up with.

And it was actually us who asked the GNSO council to allow us to pursue this project.

So if we ask the GNSO council is there a reason why you want us to look into this it'll probably just be confused and probably say you guys asked to look into this, we didn't ask you to. So I wouldn't do that. I wouldn't ask the GNSO council to explain this issue. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr. I have to excuse myself because I'm quite new in this group and I don't have the whole history.

I'm happy that I see names of people that have several years of experience and can help me also guiding you to the right discussion, the right (answer).

I see Julie)'s hand up. Is it still old hand or a new one?

Julie Hedlund: Sorry old dead hand, sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: No problem Julie.

I think that it is important that there's no confusion at all on the issue itself. And as I understood during the discussions we had in Buenos Aires it was a pro and a (con).

But we glided into several discussions where it made for myself and maybe for outsiders also not so easy to understand where it came from at the end.

So maybe we can proceed. I would call on the other members who are not present today on the call to have their approval to make a proposal to the Council and as we discussed and see what the others are thinking.

If we get an approval of the other members of the committee then we could proceed with that proposal.

Is that something we could agree on?

I don't see any objections or no one. And I would consider that we can move forward with our other item on the agenda being the - oh sorry Amr, yes.

Well at - well I see that Julie is - has her hand up. And probably she is going to clarify the text of the proposal based on what I heard from her.

Yes Julie, you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Hi Rudi. Actually I wasn't going to comment on what you are saying. What I was going to suggest is actually that why don't I put a brief summary of this discussion into the list for the benefit of those who were not at this meeting?

I think the summary would be that, you know, that at this point in time the SCI does not - the SCI recognizes or points out or emphasizes obviously in fact maybe even I might even send a draft first to you Amr, just because I want to

capture what you were saying about how we want to emphasize that the current procedures don't, you know, apply the waiver to resubmitted motions.

And then and to say that, you know, at this time, you know, the SCI could make a recommendation to the council that - pardon me, I'm not being very clear, that actually would not be taken at this time on this issue but could be revisited if there was a particularly contentious issue that arose but that perhaps this recommendation could be sent along with whatever recommendation comes out of the review of the possible changes to procedures relating to friendly amendments. Sorry to be so long-winded.

Rudi Vansnick: No problem Julie. Thanks for the clarification and then you're helping (unintelligible) the colleagues who were not present today.

So I will probably need some help with the second item of the discussion being the GNSO operating procedures with regard to (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Rudi this is Julie Hedlund. I have I think brought up the correct vertical app. Let me just scroll through here. I'll un-sync the document.

This is of the second item with respect to what - with respect to how motions are addressed, friendly motions to amendments are addressed.

So yes, and I do have the correct item up here. And if you were to look at number five that describes how the rule or process is currently used.

There is no procedure as to whether how and by whom a properly submitted motion is to be seconded and treatment of proposed amendments to such motions as either friendly or unfriendly.

These have been supported by council practice to date as opposed to operating procedural rules.

And then there is a description of the process. Motion is submitted to the council by current councilmember via the mailing list. The proposer may express a request, the motion-based seconded by another GNSO council member different councilmembers that second the submitted motion.

If submitted in time for the next meeting the motion's placed on the council agenda. The motion is discussed at the council meeting and is preceded to a vote when the (vote's) been seconded.

And then there are additional steps if there are amendments to the motion. I'm not going to read you all of those. But if you go to the second page you can see them.

And so that is the issue at hand. Whether it's - whether or not a current informal practice is sufficient or whether or not there should be actual procedures incorporated into the operating procedures to address amendments and seconds. Thank you Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. I will - I'm sorry I was cut off for maybe 20 seconds. That's happened twice already the last couple of calls (unintelligible) I had as well. I hope it's not going to happen again.

Thank you for bringing up the text of - for the discussion. I don't know if there is someone who has specific comments or remarks to the following document?

I see Amr's hand up. Yes Amr, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi. This is Amr again and again and again so apologies about hogging the mic today. But I'm - yes I just wanted to say off the bat that the issue of formalizing seconding of motions and how - and the nature or how to propose friendly amendments and certainly whether they're friendly or not.

Is there something that at least one or two counselors have already voiced a lack of affinity for? Because I think there are some on council who are not very much in favor of formalizing these processes.

I personally do not have an opinion one way or another as far as seconding motion (unintelligible) is concerned. But from experience I think we have had problems in terms of amendments, suggested friendly amendments.

This has come up twice on council in recent history. One was when there was a motion to adopt a charter for the Cross Community Working Group on Internet governance as well as the last meeting in Buenos Aires, not today, not this morning's council meeting but the meeting from last month which took place at the Buenos Aires meeting when there was a motion to request an issues report from staff on a- the PDP for a future round of new gTLD, new gTLDs.

So friendly amendments were proposed to both these motions. And the problem that I personally have with that - and I say it I guess as a councilor not as a member of this committee is that they were submitted so late it gave me no time to consult with my stakeholder group before trying to address them.

So this is something that I mean in general and I say this in terms of NTSG the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group counselors are not bound to vote one way or the other or every counselor can vote whichever way he or she chooses.

But in general it is common practice and desirable for counselors to be able to consult with our membership and try to hear all views before this happens.

And the way friendly amendments have been suggested on these two particular circumstances did not allow for this.

And they kind of just catch people off guard. Because in one of these instances in the Cross Community Working Group on Internet governance on adopting the charter for that group the amendment was suggested maybe I think two or three hours before the council meeting took place.

And this last time in Buenos Aires regarding the new gTLD round the motion was suggested during the council meeting or in the friendly amendment - apologize -- the friendly amendment was suggested during the council meeting.

And I think when this happens it causes a great deal of unnecessary confusion by the council. And we end up spending a lot of time talking about the amendments instead of discussing the actual substance of the motion.

And I would personally be in favor of some sort of formalized process on how to submit those on how to accept whether they are friendly or not just to build a form of well yes this is what council should expect when friendly amendments are suggested to motions. Thanks.

Thanks a lot Amr for the explanation. I've seen hands coming up. First Avri you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And thanks Amr. And what you just said though there's two different issues, one of which is on the table and one of which I didn't think (what).

One of the issues had to do with friendly amendments and the nature of a friendly amendment.

And that is a sort of different in GNSO rules for example Robert's Rules in that the Roberts considers the whole notion of a friendly amendment to be absurd because it includes the notion that the person that made the motion

still owns the motion whereas in with Robert's context the motion once made becomes the property of the group, no longer of the motion member.

And we have always had our own rules. You know, there's nothing that binds us to Robert's. But the rule was indeed a mistake - I mean it wasn't written anywhere. So there was the question of if indeed we do want to stick with the old tradition of friendly amendments what are the rules for?

And in fact we have seen those rules change over time. And when I first joined the council a decade ago -- really horrible to think it was that long ago - - it only took the maker of the motion to accept the friendly.

Over the years we've drifted into requiring both the maker and the seconder to agree. And in fact that gave us the situation in Buenos Aires for the first time we had the maker of the motion accept it and the seconder not.

So there is the one question of are we going to keep our tradition and are we going to codify our tradition if we keep it?

The other question that you've just brought up is timing on an amendment. Amendments whether Robert's or ours have never had a timing requirement. They are indeed amendment proposals made as late as during the reading of the motion during a meeting. There's no ten day rule. There's no 14 rule. You know, there's no rule. An amendment comes when an amendment comes.

And in fact it was, you know, so but any issue you brought up of but I don't have time to consult my constituents here, my stakeholder group on it is indeed perhaps an issue.

But it's not the one that we've actually been asked to look at as far as I can tell. I don't so, you know, there's a confounding there of two issues. And I think you added a new issue.

Because whether it's friendly or unfriendly and needs to be voted upon it is still something that you discuss before discussing, you know, or rather you vote on if you're going to vote on it or decide on it before voting on the actual motion. And that is very standard.

So I'm a little confused. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Avri, Rudi for the transcript. That was quite a good explanation and commenting. And it indeed I also consider that the timing issue is one that's be influential in decision-making.

I would say if it comes quite - if an amendment comes quite late I would consider that it is on some people the constituency of the stakeholder group that didn't have the time to jump into that amendment and have and agree on whether accepting the amendment yes or no.

So in that context I think that the timing goes together with the definition of friendly and unfriendly. But frankly that's my personal opinion. I still have someone in queue. Lori you have the floor.

Lori Schulman: Yes, hi. I'm following-up on Avri and Amr's comment because I do believe there's some conflated issues here.

And before we codify a custom it would be important to understand again going to Avri's point, you know, what are we looking at when we say friendly or unfriendly?

And I think maybe it's a good idea to perhaps with this request ask some questions back to the GNSO specially saying does, you know, does the GNSO have consensus within its own rank as to what it considers friendly?

You know, what by custom is friendly within the GNSO without worry about Robert's Rules or anything else?

I - there's probably more questions that need to be asked before we could think about codifying anything. That's my point.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Lori. I see that Avri wants to reply to your...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rudi Vansnick: ...comments.

Avri Doria: That notion is traditionally the friendly decision has been purely up to the person that made and seconded the motion. There's never been a discussion in council of, you know, deciding whether it was friendly or unfriendly or on any other basis that I could recall.

Indeed what Lori brings up though is the crux of the difference between GNSO tradition and Robert's is that two (own) changing emotion wants a time table.

The GNSO friendly motion change - friendly amendment motion is that the motion belongs still to the maker and the seconder. And therefore they have the right to decide whether it's friendly.

The Robert's notion does not have a notion of friendly in just all amendment to a motion need to be made by the entire group.

And so what Lori asked and what Rudi had said before in terms of wait a second, just because the guy that made it thinks it's friendly doesn't mean that I as a member of the council think it's friendly. That (unintelligible) is never been up there.

So indeed I think this is what the council asked us to talk about is do we accept our notion of friendly amendment and just to codify it or do we want to do something different?

And I think that is exactly the issue that the council put on our lap because people have been questioning the whole notion of friendly amendments.

So I think what Lori said and what Rudi said about why does the person that made the motion get to decide is indeed the crux of the issue we should be answering. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Avri, Rudi for the transcript.

Well I remember the discussions that we had during the Buenos Aires meeting, the council meeting where there were several amendments that were made and motions that were made and were accepted by one, not by the other, referred (unintelligible) and then no second anymore.

It made indeed life quite difficult to have an opinion and define the rules. And I think that's indeed what is on the table today is what are the real procedures that we need to follow in both cases, one being the friendly and the other one being the unfriendly amendment?

I think it would be good to see you could indeed step into a procedure where it was clear for everybody that is the way we go.

So Avri I see your hand up. This is an old or a new hand?

Avri Doria: Old hand, sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: That's all right no problem. So and going back to the request itself and as I understand from Lori's comments also today there is no clear definition of the friendly and unfriendly and in the procedures. So that would be at least

something we would need to bring up and find a way of getting it into the procedures at one time.

And the other side is how to handle it because it as far as I understood and when I (unintelligible) in Buenos Aires during the council meeting is that people get confused when sitting around the table and having to vote that what direction which was given.

So I'm just wondering if there are cases that would help us to identify the best way to proceed? And I'm just looking to the experienced councilors in the group here as well as the staff. I don't know if staff has any opinion on this.

I'm reading the definitely the comment from Mary, the consequence of (unintelligible) the proposed amendment as friendly or not is whether or not the council would then first need to vote on the first amendment (unintelligible) to accepting.

And I consider that that is an actual existing rule that it follows in that case. But as it looks like we are discussing here something that is not really a fact that is existing in the actual procedure and rules of the council we probably need to adopt something.

Looking also into the reactions majority add the amendment to the original motion. Yes, well again I think it's important that in order to be able to move forward with this discussion that we agree on - the process itself as far as I understand when an amendment is brought up it's as Avri was explaining it becomes the ownership of the council itself and then it - the council who decides on the fact that it is friendly or unfriendly.

Is that the correct perception? I see Amr's hand's up. You have the floor Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi. This is Amr. I would like to sort of just draw some - this would be my personal preference in terms of principles and how I would personally

like to see the SCI handle this without getting into specifics of who owns the motion and how it is dealt with.

I think in broad principles one of the problems is that on more than one occasions suggested friendly amendments were not perceived to be friendly by a number of councilors.

And that is pretty much because a friendly amendment will always be an issue of subjectively. It really is a subjective issue from one councilor to the next one whether they think it is friendly or not. There is no way - I don't think there's a way to sort of have an objective view on this.

So if the SCI is going to tackle this I would say that any proposal we come up needs to deal with the subjectivity just so that councilors are both equipped with the flexibility to propose then the amendments to the GNSO council as well as the...

Rudi Vansnick: Hello?

Amr Elsadr: ...(unintelligible) what to (unintelligible). I'm sorry is - my audio is not coming through?

Rudi Vansnick: We hear you.

Amr Elsadr: Can anyone hear me?

Rudi Vansnick: (Unintelligible) Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Oh, okay thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: We hear you.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, so those are the two things I (unintelligible). Yes, so these are the two things I think in principle we should really be looking at.

Councilors need to have the flexibility to proposed those friendly amendments. And on the other hand the GNSO council as a whole has to be equipped to be able to handle them when they come up without causing too much confusion or debate. So that's just my input here. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Amr for your explanation. And Rudi for the transcript.

As I mentioned in the chat to me the word friendly is more personal human perception and it's not the procedural perception.

So it at least the person who is bringing the amendment or the motion is going to define the motion as friendly I don't know.

And I would rather see this as something that is (aside) the question of procedures - it made procedures more difficult I think using if we would need to clarify how - in how far is something friendly or in how far is something unfriendly?

And I think there is a big debate that would take us too far away from what we need to be. And I don't know what others have in mind on the process we have to follow here.

While I understand the question is about allowing in a procedural and rate the definition of friendly or unfriendly amendments to motion that we take that I see in front of me and that's where we need to identify is this what we want to work on and find a way of putting a text together that describes the process of how to handles these cases?

I see Angie's comment in the chat is agreeing with Amr are we working against and agreed upon definition of friendly?

And so again it's a point where I'm actually wondering what the group wants to go forward with. And do we look first of all into the definition of friendly and unfriendly and try to have a clear explanation and definition of it before we start having the procedures part of it?

Anyone having an opinion on this?

Yes, I'll - I see Amr's reaction and he thinks that defining the friendly is not a requirement here, rather unnecessary. Although I had the feeling that there was this interpretation of who considers that as (unintelligible) so that's the reason why I was bringing my personal perception of the wording.

So I see that Avri has to chair another meeting in a few minutes. As I don't have a clear view on what would be the next step in the debate here on this point maybe we can relate to the next meeting further discussion debate on this.

I see Julie's hand up. Yes Julie you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. Yes I think yes this isn't the first time this group has started to discuss this issue. And we (unintelligible) some members on the call.

It makes sense I think to probably continue this discussion on the list as Avri is suggesting. Although I think within this group there seems to be consensus that we don't want to go down a path of trying to define what is friendly or unfriendly.

But it seems that there is possible interest in on drafting some kind of, you know, codification of what are now currently informal customs to include in the procedures.

But it probably would be helpful to have more discussion before we get to that point.

I'll just note that we don't have a next regularly scheduled meeting. We had been having them on a biweekly basis and which would put us in two weeks on to the 6th of August or, you know, we can wait until after that.

I'm just wondering if folks here have a sense of when - and Rudi also yourself when you might want the next meeting to be?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie, Rudi for the transcript. Well I was also thinking about having the next call in two weeks. But I notice that August is probably the month where we have most of the people having vacation.

So I'm just wondering maybe the best thing to do and something I would like to propose is that we send out a Doodle with the request of having the call the 6th of August which is the first week of August if I'm not wrong or two weeks later which brings us to close to the end of August.

So what about having a Doodle and proceed on the list with the first discussions and see if we have enough people for the 6th of August? Otherwise it would be again two weeks later.

Julie Hedlund: Two weeks later. Yes in fact I'm not sure that we necessarily do a Doodle but we could consider that. That would be the 6th, the 20th or then that first week in September.

Yes, so we'll think if you got three choices probably have to do a Doodle because it gets a little complicated. Then staff will go ahead and work on that.

Or we Mary has pointed out we could just schedule for the 6th and cancel if we have too many apologies too.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Well, to me the 6th is not the problem. I'm available. I don't know about others. Eventually we could indeed schedule the call and at least have some pressure of doing things just like we did today also and have a first (word) done on the mailing list.

So I would like to propose this process and start having some more discussions on the mailing list on this issue and schedule for the 6th of August. If we have too much - too many apologies we could then cancel the call and go for the 20th of August.

Is that okay for everyone?

Julie Hedlund: It looks like - Rudi this is Julie. It looks like it's trending towards September at least in the chat room and skipping August.

I do know August is a heavy vacation time for lots of people. So I think what I'll do is I'll send a note to the list and say that this came up, see if there are any objections to scheduling for that first week in September. And if not then we can proceed accordingly. Serious trending so Ken.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes (unintelligible) well proceed as such Julie. Send out a message to the list and we'll see and who is available in August. And then we can see if we have a call in August.

But we should start having the - some exchanges of ideas on this issue in front of us on the mailing list.

So I don't know if there is any other business we need to take care of now?

Julie Hedlund: Rudi I'll just note I'm taking the action to work with Amr on some language concerning recommendation on the first issue that is a waiver of the ten day notification on resubmission of motions.

I'll also draft something to get the discussion started on the friendly amendment issue on the list as well if that's okay.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Julie for that help. That will indeed help us moving forward.

So if there is no other business to handle I would like to thank you all for your participation in this call and enjoy vacation. Enjoy the good weather if it's possible and see you on the mailing list.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thanks, bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Have a great day.

Terri Agnew: And once again the meeting has been adjourned...

Rudi Vansnick: Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: ...(unintelligible) stop recording. Thank you so much for joining and please remember to disconnect all remaining lines.

END