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Jonathan Robinson: Okay, everyone. Good morning. Let's get the show on the road with GNSO weekend Sessions. So if we could - are we good to go at the back? Thank you very much. So good morning everyone. My name is Jonathan Robinson, Chair of the GNSO Council. Welcome to all of you -- councilors, staff and other members of the community who are here to join us for the weekend sessions of the GSNO here at ICANN 53 in Buenos Aeries.

As you know, these are weekend sessions open to all and particularly important for GNSO participants to - and to join in to a series of meetings convened and organized by the GNSO Council in order to remain current and to perform our key role as managers of the GNSO policy process. We'll probably start off with a quick roll call but before we do that, I'll just make a couple of remarks.

Where we make sure we need to pause. It's likely to be me responsible for managing the change over between the sessions but if anyone else is remember we need to just stop and create an opportunity to pause the
recording so that we can pause the recording on the transcript. Whenever you speak, please announce yourself, your name so it's clearly recorded on the transcript.

Don't assume people know who you are just because you're either visible or have a name tag so please state your name before speaking and we'll fill you in a little later on any arrangements for the council this evening for the dinner and any other practical points that come up.

So Glen before we begin if I could just ask you to take a quick roll call so we know who's here and can welcome anyone who's new or not usually here.

Glen DeSaintgery Thank you Jonathan, I'll do that. (Brent Forces)?

(Brent Forces): I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Donna Austin?

Donna Austin: I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Jonathan Robinson?

Jonathan Robinson: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: James Bladel?

James Bladel: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yoav Keren's absent and I don’t know if Yoav will be able to join us remotely but Michele Neylon is taking his place. Frédéric Guillemaut?
Frédéric Guillemaut: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Thomas Sheetcat) is not here yet. He will be a bit late this morning due to another meeting. Phil Corwin?

Phil Corwin: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Susan Kawaguchi?

Susan Kawaguchi: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Brian Winterfeldt? Not here yet. Heather Forrest?

Heather Forrest: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Osvaldo Novoa?

Osvaldo Novoa: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Tony Holmes?

Man: Actually it's me, (unintelligible) Tony is coming in the afternoon.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. (Unintelligible)? Edward Mullet?

Edward Mullet: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Amr Elsadr will probably be on remote with us on the line. Amr, are you there?
Amr Elsadr: I'm remote now Glen, yes, I'm on remote now. Can you hear me?

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much. Yes, we can hear you loudly and clearly. David Cake?

David Cake: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Marília Maciel? Not here yet. Stephanie Perrin?

Stephanie Perrin: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Carlos Gutierrez?

Carlos Gutierrez: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: And Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. I don’t think was - is able to be here because of conflict in meetings with the (unintelligible). And Patrick Myles, our CCNSO liaison? Probably not. Avri Doria?

Avri Doria: Good morning.

Glen DeSaintgery: And for stop we have Lars Hoffman, Steve Chan, Mary Wong, Marika Konings, and Terri Agnew and myself, Glen DeSaintgery. Thank you Jonathan, over to you...

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Glen. So welcome again everyone. We've got a full agenda for the day as you will have seen in what's been posted. We're starting around, well, almost exactly 15 minutes late. I'm sure we'll manage to work through our way through the agenda as we go.
First meeting of the day is to hear from the Standing Committee on GNSO improvements who have met this morning and are in a position to give us an update through Anne who is here up at the front. Over to you Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you Jonathan. This is Anne Aikman-Scalese for the 2015 SCI chair. I do have a great development to report in that we have this morning elected our Vice Chair to SCI which is (Rudy Vasnec) as a volunteer and been elected in this morning's meeting to serve as Vice Chair. So this will be a very short report.

Next slide please. Just as a reminder the scope of work from SCI is that we review and assess the effective functioning of the procedures and Working Group guidelines. Two categories of review -- the first one being on request for procedures and guidelines that have been identified as presenting immediate problems not necessarily in the sense of emergency but just current problems. and the second responsibility is with respect to periodic time scale review for all operating procedures and guidelines and our jurisdiction is limited to request that are identified by GNSO Council or a group chartered by the GNSO Council.

Next slide please. So the council did in fact pass motions and assigning work to us involving two topics. We are currently working on a possible application of a 10-day waiver rule to resubmit in motions. When these changes were made to operating procedures last year, it became clear that council operating procedures required a clarification as to whether or not the 10-day waiver rule could be applied to resubmitted motions.

We've had a couple of discussions on this point. Initially there was sentiment in favor of applying 10-day waiver rule but in further fleshing out the discussion this morning in our meeting, more disagreement on this point
developed so we had a very lively discussion at this morning's meeting that is likely to continue into our next call and the basic question there is whether it's appropriate for a resubmitted motion to be submitted on 24-hour notice council or not given that it's a motion that's already been voted down.

So on the one hand we have the consideration that the explanation may be more appropriately given 10 days prior to council meeting. On the other hand, we have the face guard safety net of the fact that the 10-day waiver rule which would involve a 24-hour advance submission is subject to essentially a veto by any one councilor -- so that's what is currently being discussed.

Those discussions will continue in our next call and if you have any feedback to provide to your SCI members, please do so in advance of our next call and it may be a good time here. We realize that this is not at the top of everyone's mind right now but if you do have thoughts on it please communicate that to your SCI members. In connection with membership, there are a couple of, I guess, I'd say one major and one minor concern.

The major concern and I'd like to ask to Avri to comment further on this as well is that we do not have participation by some of our members in these calls. I think notably we've had an absence of contracted parties representation and as Avri pointed out in this morning's meeting because SCI works on full consensus it would be good if we could have participation from contracted parties. Avri, could I differ to you make further comment on that?

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks, Avri Doria speaking. I mean you pretty much made the point but, for example, at this morning we - only one of the houses was attending the meeting not the other house and it wasn't just this morning. I mean, it's been frequent and I understand that the difficulty of getting into the SCI issue's and there, you know, sort of intricacy and, you know, could be used to describe it
with other words, but - and this is something that has been a pattern for a long time and we often appealed for the contractive parties house to participate more.

And yes, at the end of the day we have a full consensus and sometimes those consensuses are active consensus where we ask everyone to state affirmatively whether they support something going forward. Some of the time, though it can be a passive consensus and there's a real problem if we don't have both houses participating in these - the "nitty gritty" of these discussions while we're getting to it -- so I really just want to make a plea to the council members to get your primary or at least your alternate folks to start participating and find new victims for the roles if, you know, the folks you've got now are just too busy because of other stuff to do it.

And I totally understand being too busy to do it at SCI and yet if you're on it, it's probably important to do it. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese:    Great, thank you Avri. And then the minor point is there are. I think, a three open alternate open positions for SCI so if you could please, you know, try in this meeting beneficiaries to make sure that their alternates appointed properly and that the participation is taking place so we appreciate it.

The second issue that Council asked us to look at was the issue of friendly amendments demotions and the procedures for proposing those. That is going to be the second issue in sequence after we finish our discussions and recommendations with respect to the 10-day waiver rule application to resubmit the motions.
And then with respect to our periodic timescale review of all guidelines and procedures that is differed pending the results of the GNSO review and consideration by Council. Next slide please. I think I just summarized that. That - these are some of the issues that long-term we'd be looking at for. In our periodic review there are things that have been discussed to some degree by Council but will not be taken up SCI at this time -- voting thresholds, Working Group consensus levels, full review of operating procedures -- those are things that are more complicated than involved and SCI would be taking those up after the first two procedural issues that we're considering for you.

So thank you and if there are any questions Avri is our GNSO liaison and I'm here, Rudy's here -- so if you want to know about anything what we're doing, we'd be happy to answer questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Anne. Question, comments, points of input for the SCI? Did you discuss at all the interaction with the work of the GNSO review that's going on? Does that come up at all and how that might interact with the work at SCI?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Discussions thus far Jonathan have been than SCI needs to wait for the final report to be processed by Council and to receive our instructions from Council. I do want to encourage all members to try to stay up on, you know, be current with what's going on with GNSO review and to read that ourselves but we likely won't take any action until Council itself has processed that review and considered where SCI should go from there. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good, that sounds right but I think it's a really good point to make sure that you're aware of that so that there isn't perhaps an intent to initiate or
suggest initiating any work by the SCI if it's coming through that channel. It's just making - that coordination sounds sensible.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So in terms of the alternates -- the requirement for alternates -- and insure contracted parties have participation, Steve can you capture that as an action that we need to make sure there's a note goes out to the Council that's left the first action that comes out of this is to insure that there's a follow-up on that? Thanks.

Any other comments, questions, points on this item? Okay, thanks Anne and your colleagues who've started the day before this meeting to get the work on the way and we'll look forward to keeping in touch with you on this.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thank you Jonathan.