

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the Standing Committee on
Improvements Implementation on Thursday, 17 September 2015

Jennifer Standiford:HI Terri

Terri Agnew:Welcome Jennifer!

Jennifer Standiford:i will follow along for this meeting via chat - i
am also on the UASG call at the same time.

Amr Elsadr:Hi Terri and all. Apologies in advance for any
background noise today.

Avri Doria:I will also be on two calls at once, also listening in to
the UASG meeting.

Terri Agnew:Lori Schulman has joined audio

Rudi Vansnick:and as it had never happened it is unreasonable to
spend too much time in the SCI

Rudi Vansnick:and as it had ... sorry

Amr Elsadr:I've always been a fan of consensus calls being done
on-list, not on calls.

Amr Elsadr:Perhaps a deadline to raise a lack of consensus?

Marika Konings:I think on most of the previous issues a call for
consensus would go out on the mailing list - those objecting would
be asked to express their view on the mailing list.

Amr Elsadr:I like Marika's suggestion. Will get the job done. :)

Rudi Vansnick:which consensus does the council expect ?

Marika Konings:for SCI issues it is full consensus

Rudi Vansnick:yes indeed Marika's proposal would most
probably work for us

Marika Konings:it doesn't specify how that is assessed

Avri Doria:actually i think full consensus applies, which don't
need to be affirmative about it.

Marika Konings:@Avri - that is also my understanding

Avri Doria:i think Marika's suggestion of no objections before next
meeting is sufficient.

Amr Elsadr:Although full consensus is not necessary, no harm in
getting it anyway. I believe we do have full consensus on this. We
just need to go through the motions of a consensus call. I suggest
doing this on list (using "passive" consensus).

Amr Elsadr:No objections.

Marika Konings:@Anne - yes, that is correct

Marika Konings:with regard to your question on current practice

Marika Konings:As a reminder, the Council asked the SCI to:
codify the existing customary practices of the GNSO Council (as described above).If the SCI believes that the current practices are inappropriate, the SCI should convey its reasons for such belief to the Council and develop new processes to govern the seconding of motions and amendments to motions.

Amr Elsadr:@Marika: regarding whether or not the current practices are appropriate, some on council are not very eager about the idea to change the current practices at all.

Amr Elsadr:Not so sure about the seconder.

Marika Konings:As far as I recall, if a motion has been seconded, the seconder also would need to agree

Amr Elsadr:Technically, a new more agreeable seconder could be recruited to replace the first one during the council meeting. :)

Amr Elsadr:But since seconding motions is not in the GNSO OP at all..., it's all a little fuzzy.

Marika Konings:@Amr, that is also within the request of the Council to the SCI. To clarify whether, how and by whom a properly submitted motion is to be seconded

Amr Elsadr:Yup.

Marika Konings:@Anne - I have my hand up. Not sure if you are seeing it.

Avri Doria:true but that has been a practice forever. since at least 2005

Amr Elsadr:In BA, the council was asked to vote on the amendment to the motion before voting on the actual motion.

Amr Elsadr:Something we may wish to also consider.

Marika Konings:@Amr - that has also been the standing practice
Marika Konings:in the case of an unfriendly motion

Amr Elsadr:Ah. Wasn't familiar with that one. Thanks Marika. ;-)

Marika Konings:A Council member can ask for a deferral if they are of the view that the amendment needs to be further considered.

Rudi Vansnick:agree with Amr

Marika Konings:I found Mary's overview and I have posted that on the right side in the note pod

Marika Konings:the only issue is when the motion has already been deferred once....

Amr Elsadr:To be clear, deferral of motions is not a tradition. It is in the OPs.

Marika Konings:as no second deferral is allowed

Rudi Vansnick:does a second deferral could end up as a new motion entered

Amr Elsadr:@Rudi: I was just thinking about that. After a deferral, what would happen if another amendment was suggested (at the second council meeting). :)

Terri Agnew:Julie has disconnected from audio

Marika Konings:I'm looking at the operating procedures, but cannot find it - I thought it was a clarification that was provided by the SCI and not a change to the operating procedures, but will keep on looking.

Amr Elsadr:I was actually unaware of the need of the chair to approve the deferral. Will have to refresh my memory. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick:i remember it happened if i'm not wrong it was in Singapore

Amr Elsadr:We have some homework. :)

Marika Konings:I'll make a note of that

Amr Elsadr:Yes..., thanks Anne. By codify, I meant suggest changes to the OPs.

Lori Schulman:How would we "document" Would be appropriate to ask for some kind of flow?

Marika Konings:The Council resolution also said: The GNSO Council suggests that in carrying out this task the SCI consult past GNSO Chairs and Councilors as well as commonly accepted guides and practices (such as Robert's Rules of Order) and other ICANN bodies (such as the Board and other SO/ACs).

Lori Schulman:I see Mary's doc but I wouldn't say its definitive.

Marika Konings:and Anne is correct, the Council request was

based on the procedure as it was outlined by Mary (as the process to codify)

Marika Konings:it was part of the request that the Council voted on

Lori Schulman:Thank you Marika. I was not clear about that.

Amr Elsadr:Hmm..., looking through the OPs now. Can't find the bit on deferral of motions. Will go through it more thoroughly offline.

Rudi Vansnick:thanks Ann for this good meeting

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.

Marika Konings:It was a letter clarifying, no change to ops procedures. I'll send it out shortly.

Marika Konings:Thanks Anne

Lori Schulman:Thanks for clarifying tough topics Anee.