

**ICANN Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation Subteam B
Monday 21 March 2016 at 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation Subteam B call on the Monday 21 March 2016 at 16:00 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-21mar16-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Angie Graves – BC – Primary
Amr Elsadr – NCUC - Primary
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC – Primary – Chair
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts – BC - Alternate
Sara Bockey – RrSG - Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary

No Apologies

ICANN Staff:

Julie Hedlund
Michelle DeSmyter

Coordinator: Your recordings have started. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thanks (Martha). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.
Welcome to the SCI Subteam B Meeting on the 21st of March at 1600 UTC.
On the call today we have Anne Aikman-Scalese, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben,
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Amr Elsadr, Sarah Bockey. We have no

apologies. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself Michelle DeSmyter.

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

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much Michelle and who would like to Chair this meeting. I know Anne before you had been ill and Wolf-Ulrich had kindly helped Chair in your absence. So maybe I'll let the two of you work out how you want to run the meeting.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks very much Julie. This is Anne for the transcript. I'm hoping that because Wolf-Ulrich had really taken leadership role on this issue on the Subteam and was also I think present in Morocco, which I wasn't able to be, I'm hoping that Wolf-Ulrich will take over leading this group. I think that he has, you know, at this point the best understanding of all the issues. And so Wolf-Ulrich, can you do that for us?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi Anne. Thank you. Thanks very much for trusting in me. And it's okay. I could do so. And I do hope that we can come to a result today so that there shouldn't be any more need to reconvene unless the SCI and others come back with some questions presented.

But so if I may, I would like to start this way. Anne, not Anne; Julie has put on the screen my question but before that there was - okay, yes. If you scroll down Julie, I think there was your minutes or short report from what we have done in the last meeting in Marrakech. So on the SCI level and what came out from that meeting.

So to - as I understood that and then recall that there is nothing to be done with regards to the Issue 1, that was decided about that; and Issue 2 is one which we had an extended discussion about that with regards to the question

how the Vice Chairs or how Vice Chairs would continue or the Vice Chair task should be done in continuing in case a Chair has not been elected.

And our last proposal to that was, you know, from our group was that we should create - we would like to have created a kind of designated Vice Chair from both halves, if possible designated in that sense that should just be the task to elect the Chair, should be allocated to those Vice Chairs and nothing else.

So that was some discussion about. It seemed to be a little bit complicated to do so within the different parts of the Houses since each stakeholder only has its own procedure to do so. That was one point.

And the other point was that it was not anticipated or in cases if it takes longer than just one time to elect successfully a Chair that what does it mean with regards to the general tasks of the Council to be done?

And we understood there that the Vice Chairs normally, usually are the representatives of the Council in case - at all in case the Vice - the Chair is not available. So it means they have to take over the task from the Chair. I think that's - and that is - that might be a different situation.

So this is one issue we should discuss today. And the other one was - other open one was the - with regard to the timeline. (Berry) couldn't - not discuss that because of time constraints during the Marrakech meeting.

And there was a very last issue right now here on the screen is - well which is connected to the Issue 2. It's a question, the normal Council business relation to - with regard to the Vice Chair.

So okay. These are the points we should discuss so today. And well, I myself -- and Julie thank you; you put it on the screen -- was thinking about what to do with regards to Issue 2.

I think it's - what our goal is still understand to have a very simple solution if possible, not - it shouldn't be any - in any way complicated. So and I have seen a kind of preference regarding the continuation of the so far Vice Chairs in case they are able to continue meaning that they will be available.

Also there may be - the term may have end already. That perhaps even a preference to that. And so if that is not the case; so I put here in writing that in case these Vice Chairs or one of them is not available, then because of whoever knows, then the - a designation could be done for this case.

So that was what I put together here. But we should open - just open for questions understanding and for comments and I'm hearing whatever you mean. So I see first Anne please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. This is Anne for the transcript. I think it's very important that you have had a discussion I gather in Marrakech about the fact that the Vice Chair or Vice Chairs may need to preside over meetings and issues that something other than the election of the Chair; that there may be business that has to move forward other than just the Chair election.

And first of all, I guess I'm wondering since I wasn't there in Morocco if that's correct. And then as to the question that I have about that is is it customary for the Vice Chairs to simply work out between the two of them who's - who would be, you know, running a meeting or calling a question.

Is there a need to specify how it's determined which of the - essentially you can't have two people running a meeting? That's the bottom line in my comment, so. If somebody could enlighten me on that, that would be great.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Anne. But if I may just - Anne, I saw two questions from your side before I hand over to Amr. The first one was there is like (unintelligible) how it

came to discussion well that other tasks be on the election. It could happen and could be - (that should) be done by the Vice Chairs.

So it came from the discussion just in case if the Council is not able to elect a Chair; also in the - according to the procedures that maybe, you know, the procedures say I think until two or three rounds they describe the process if I recall that correctly; at least one more round as we had. So it's described there.

And if that fails, so it, you know, then there is a timeline given by the procedures called before for example new eliminations for Chair election could be done.

So that means in between - does it mean that the Council should not do its - or it's (general rule). So they discussed (much about) no, it shouldn't be because as ongoing work and somebody has to do that work and this is nominated Vice Chair they're doing that. If there is no Chairs that means there should be - there could be other tasks than just to perform the election.

So that was first question. The other question from your side was - just help me.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. The question related to how it's determined which Vice Chair would be...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...running any particular meeting...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...or issue?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. This is not determined in the procedure. It's just determined that the Vice Chairs are the - are going to do that on behalf of the Chair. And how they are going to do that. Well it's maybe that's the Chair in this anomaly, you know. It happened in the past (that way). I mean I was (unintelligible) Vice Chairs. (Jonathan) told me oh I could do that or he asks (David), could you do that. Well it's open, you know. So they have to...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Cooperate, yes. It's about just cooperation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So Amr please.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. This is Amr. Yes. Before I ask the question, I'll raise the point that I wanted to raise and I'd just like to ask something regarding the Council business continuing as normal and apart from interim Vice Chairs arranging for elections of a Chair.

There are some Council activities that as per the operating procedures they really do need to move forward. So for example, if staff has prepared the final issues reports for a PDP, then according to the PDP manual, the GNSO Council has to consider it at the next meeting.

This isn't the sort of thing that can be deferred or should not be deferred to another meeting. So it would - there may be scenarios such as that where the Council would have to indeed continue with its business.

Council can for example defer a motion or separate a charter from an issues report so that the charter of an upcoming PDP can be considered in a separate motion at a later date. But the issues report should ideally move

forward once it has - as long as staff has prepared it in time for - to be considered in a Council meeting.

So in the absence of a Chair in a situation like that, GNSO Council would still need to consider this and this is part of what Council business is. So just - yes. Just wanted to point that out. And I'm not sure - there may be other situations as well where Council has to act on something and those may be circumstantial or they may also be associated with guidelines or rules in the operating procedures.

But the other point I really wanted to raise, and I know I raised this in Marrakech and forgive me for not recalling exactly where we left it off. But - and I also apologize for jumping into the Subteam once you folks have done so much of the work already. But I had some problems with the ICANN mailing list.

But I'm still having a little bit for trouble understanding why the non-voting NonCom appointee would be eligible to serve as a Vice Chair on behalf of one of the two Houses.

My understanding of the non-voting NCA's rule is that that person is not meant to be affiliated to any of the two Houses. And I'm just concerned that having this person be eligible to - even as an interim Vice Chair sort of distorts the purpose that the non-voting NonCom appointees meant to serve on the GNSO Council. And I'd be grateful to hear thoughts of others on why this may be desirable. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you Amr for the question. Well, I think...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Wolf-Ulrich, it's Anne. Maybe I could just in relation to that make a comment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Just before you answer Anne, just because Lawrence was the next one, I think - I don't know whether this - your question or your comment is related to that Lawrence. And I would like to give...

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: No, no. It's not. Lawrence speaking for the record. My question is not related to that. So maybe Anne could go ahead to provide some insight.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Amr, just very quickly. This is Anne for the transcript. One of the discussions we had I think I might have suggested the possibility that a NonCom representative could step in as interim Vice Chair precisely because they're not voting.

And the sort of the - I guess you would say the neutrality issue. But then I think it was pointed out to me that you might have the same situation with NonCom representatives both going off at the same time.

And then someone said well, you know, you could still - one of the Houses could still appoint or designate -- I guess you'd say designate -- a NonCom representative anyway if they wanted to.

And so that was the genesis of the discussion was actually - I think that was looking for somebody, you know, neutral - one person to take that role perhaps or - so that's how it came about. I don't have strong feelings either way myself with respect to the issue of NonCom serving as Vice Chair but that's kind of how the discussion came about. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks Anne. And if I may add to that, I think we, you know, maybe we're talking about the NCAs to be included for eligibility. So we - well, at least to my mind (okay), we are not taking into consideration that the Council may have additional tasks to be done besides the election for - you know, we were

just done talking about the designation, which included just the task for the election, nothing else.

So under this understanding - so the NCAs were included plus we wouldn't like to exclude anybody of the Council because anybody is eligible for Chair including the non-voting NCA.

And for this role of designated person, that was my understanding to be included that the non-voting NCA should also be included. I - so right now after the discussion with regards to the specific tasks related to the policy development and all the other things, you know.

Well, I may have to reconsider that Amr though for those last things that I find it positively we should discuss it. But we can reconsider that. But before we do that, I give the floor to Lawrence please.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Okay. Thanks again. This is Lawrence for the records. I recall that, you know, the major concern with regards getting somebody to stand in where - and an interim becomes conclusive, following up from the meeting we had in Marrakech, the major concern was that, you know, it could take some time to - and some process to also get replacement from the House - having to go back to the House and all that.

And so we're thinking - we're (not) thinking that, you know, extending the term of the current Vice Chairs in case their tenure ends with the AGM might be a much simpler option.

But looking at that direction which was - which is now beginning to form our first option, looking at that, a question that comes to mind is you've - we can go to the (unintelligible) extending the tenure or Vice Chair in order to have a conclusive election.

Then why do we have to in the first instance go that route with I recall as well extend the tenure of the outgoing Chairperson to complete or conclude the election.

So if - so I'm just thinking and I want the opinion of the House. If we were to go to extent of seeking any of the House to extend the tenure of a Vice Chair, then why don't we just do that for the Chairperson and, you know, just have the process completed. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (A distinct) question. Thank you Lawrence. So I give the floor to Amr.
New ideas Amr, please.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. And I just had a quick follow up and a suggestion on my last comment and particularly after hearing Anne's response. Anne, thank you for that actually. And the scenario where two Vice Chairs may be term limited and we may have incoming new NonCom appointees was not a scenario that I had considered. And it's certainly worthy of consideration.

But I just wanted to be clear on something. When I was speaking of the NonCom appointees, I wasn't referring to all three of them. But I think Julie's captured this well in the notes on the right of the screen.

As you all know, we have three NonCom appointees on the GNSO Council. There are two voting NonCom appointees that are attached to each of the Houses. So one NonCom appointee for each House and then we have one non-voting NonCom appointee that is independent of any of the two Houses.

And I would think that this person is both eligible to run for Council Chair as well maybe also be eligible to serve as an interim Council Chair if necessary. But my question was more on this very specific individual non-voting NonCom appointee who is not affiliated or associated with any of the Houses being a Vice Chair in one of those.

And in considering this, I would suggest that maybe it might be a good idea to reach out to the NonCom itself and maybe ask them what it is they consider when they're appointing a non-voting NonCom appointee to the GNSO Council.

And then maybe just make sure that there are no conflicts between the considerations being made in making that appointment and sort of having the non-voting NonCom appointee being designated as an Interim Vice Chair for either of the Houses.

I've been getting some input from them on what sort of criteria they look at and what they're actually looking for the non-voting NCA's role to be might be helpful to us in our out discussion. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay Amr. Thank you. Lawrence, is that an old hand?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Yes. Sorry. I'll take it down.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So then Julie for this round and then maybe start a new round.
Julie, please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie. And I just put something in the chat as well. I think Lawrence if I understood correctly was asking about why we couldn't just extend the term of - or say an outgoing Chair or outgoing Vice Chairs.

We did discuss this. And it may have been a meeting that Lawrence was unable to attend. But the terms are set in the bylaws. In order to extend the term, this has to be done via a - what's called a -- if I remember it correctly and I don't have the terminology right in front of me -- a special circumstance.

Generally the special circumstance would apply not to a Chair but it could apply to a Vice Chair in the case where a - perhaps one of the Houses does

not have a candidate to replace one of the Vice Chairs for whatever reason and then has to ask for a special circumstance to have the term of a Vice Chair extended. And then this has to go to a special vote, which I think the threshold is - it might be a super-majority. I have to check that as well.

Any - at any rate, I would point out that it's not a simple process. It's not a process that would necessarily happen quickly because either one of the Houses in this case would have to say yes, we want a special circumstance; yes, that would have to go to a vote at a regular Council meeting. So I think that was why we avoided invoking that extension in this case. But others may remember differently. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay Julie. Thank you very much. So we've got several ideas right now. And we got a set of issues or problems related to these ideas. Let me just find out where we could - how we could proceed.

So you're discussion - well, two parts of getting out of this issue. The one is well, shall we - we would like to have a simple solution, right. That's the first thing. And the one is can we make use of this aid in this way - of the incumbent Vice Chairs or the outgoing Vice Chairs. Or at least (a search) of the incumbent one if there are Vice Chairs available still and ongoing their job. That would be the first question.

Should they be in charge as long as no Vice Chair is elected? So that will be the first question. If there are two of the Vice Chairs available shall continue that job. That is the first easy solution. The other would be what's going to happen if one of them is still available but the other is a new one. Or he - well the other Vice Chair was the outgoing Vice Chair and the outgoing member of the Council.

Shall we continue with just one Vice Chair doing their job until the election is done? That would be the next question. Third is then what's going to happen

this - suppose of not continuing, how can we make use of them? Let me say this way. Not to touch on a complicated thing like bylaws or what else.

But just to make use of their knowledge. They have shown their experience in order to continue Council's work. Is that a way where we could find appropriate measures to take? And then discuss how we can make use of them or if it's - just then directed to the issues we have (unintelligible).

So this is the three question I would put to the audience here (around). And well I see first it was Anne and then Julie. Please. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. This is Anne for the transcript. I don't speak on behalf of my constituency but certainly in the interest of simplicity I definitely favor the approach that if the - either one of the Vice Chairs is remaining on term in Council that that person would continue as interim Chair or the term would be extended as Vice Chair for this purpose of both, you know, conducting meetings as Amr pointed out may be necessary as well as the election.

I find Lawrence's suggestion really intriguing even though as Julie points out - and again, in the interest of simplicity, I mean would it be possible if there is no Vice Chair continuing and we are satisfied with the answers from the NonCom, should we be considering the possibility that if no Vice Chair is available that the non-voting NonCom appointee should serve as interim Chair?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh, it's an idea and Lawrence is agreeing to that. So Amr has a comment. Please Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. This is Amr. Apologies. It takes me a few seconds to get off mute. Yes. I think the non-voting NonCom or any of the NonCom appointees actually - scenario where they'd be appointed as interim Chair to the Council is a good one at least as an available option.

But I think it needs to be a nuanced sort of option because I think it shouldn't be a status quo where okay, the two Houses have failed to designate interim Vice Chairs for one reason or another. That really - doesn't really matter what the reasons are.

But I think the Council has to show some form of agreement for one of the NonComs serving as an interim Chair for the Council. And one of the reasons for that is I think we've seen in the past at least a few NonCom appointees not being as up to speed with other Councilors. And they may be coming to the GNSO Council from outside of the community. They may be new. They may not know too much about what to do.

So I don't think putting in a procedure in the PDP manual or the bylaws that sort of makes this a de facto case, you know. I don't think that's a very good idea. I think there has to be some (rule) to - for the Council to explore and consider that option and either decide to go ahead with it or decide against it, so. Just my thought on this. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you. So yes. Understood that in the direction that should be an option (now) to be given to the Council. We should take into consideration all of that.

If we go that way well to nominate a Chair, you know, an interim Chair, then this is this guy, you know. He or she they have to confirm that. They have to - they have to confirm that they are willing to do that. So we have to take this also into consideration.

So as you were told if he or she is very new one and doesn't really know, is not - doesn't feel that would be the right thing to do for herself or himself in case he or her has to guide several meetings. So that would be very tricky. So we should discuss that. But it's an idea. And Lawrence, you put your hand.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Yes. Thank you again. This is Lawrence for the records. Sorry.

Well the initial question I asked I think I mixed something up or maybe it was due to the discussions we had in Marrakech. I had an impression that we're changing towards - we're tilting towards seeing that they - that should in case an election was inconclusive and a Chair's tenure had ended that we're tilting towards extending that of the Vice Chair.

So I - my fear was what's un-addressed. We had our (unintelligible) there, you know, it was on that - the issue that it might be difficult. It was extending the Vice Chairs will mean having to go back to the House.

Now that said, it might not - we might not actually for a long while come into a situation where we are unable to conclude an election. But should in case we get - we have a scenario like what happened in the past where the election becomes inconclusive and the Chairs in your House run out, they - the fallback could be that if one of the Vice Chairs or both Vice Chairs tenure continue then they could preside over an election.

I believe the election is - it's so important that it definitely (overrules) the continuous job of the Council. I say that why? Because I feel that with proper leadership in place, its first and foremost legitimacy on whatever the Council's resolution definitely comes in. What if our Council resolution is the outcome?

So if in the process of conducting an election becomes inconclusive, there might not be some form of legitimacy to any Council decision. I mean talking about the walkway for (the problem).

So I think one thing that we could try to focus on is try to see that if an election becomes inconclusive then the next serious business for the Council would be to conclude an election in such a way to get their officers in place.

So if we have a fallback where we are saying that at least one of the Vice Chairs continues, then there's an opportunity for the other House to also nominate someone just for the conduct of that election. And once that election is over, that role can reverse back.

In the case where we do not now have - I mean in the case where the Chair is not - we don't have a Chair (on ground) and the tenure of the two Vice Chairs also ends, then as another fallback it could be a third level could now be getting or having the NonCom appointee to oversee an election.

And merely after the election is done, which the whole process could just be in one particular meeting; merely after that whole process is concluded, revert back to the natural role that the NonCom appointee has while the new officials take up their responsibility. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay. Lawrence, thank you very much. So how can I proceed? So we have - I think we have here put together different options also with these different views on what could happen, you know, with regards to the election.

So while coming back to the beginning of the discussion, I think we should take - and I also - we should take into consideration that the primary goal of the Council is to perform a successful election of the Council Chair.

So this is what I would like to propose. I (currently mention) the situation that while the Council is coming to such a deadlock that over several rounds a Chair is not - could not be found.

Also, you know, the existing present rules include that case. It's just the case well, that the question what we're discussing here is here that the Vice Chair's term is going to end. Not a question that there will be any deadlock and we don't see any end well to - that the elections are coming to a successful end to do so.

So having that said, I would like to put together well these options. I'm just thinking about how we should proceed Julie. I saw that we will have very soon I think also this week an SCI meeting. So do we have something to suggest to the SCI? A specific way or do we have more questions to (ask).

Should we go that way to tell them yes, we are - we will get in contact with the NonCom asking with regards to the NCA to the non-voting NCA and then come up with the proposal going that way probably with regard to the NCA? Or how shall we proceed?

In this respect there's one additional question, which comes to me Amr, and as well - the understanding what is the - what is the trigger point when we start - we are going to start thinking about to take the or to suggest that the (unintelligible) voting NCA should take over that task? What is the real point when this should happen?

Is it just in case - in any case when it happens that both Vice Chairs shall not be more available? Or is it - are there other cases? And I understand if I'm correct on that option that this is a -- how to say that -- it's not a kind of selection of an interim Chair. It's just a kind of more or less mandate to be given to that person though.

And if he or she can just say yes or no but there is no however alternative for that. Is that the case? That was my understanding. Correct? That's my question. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Yes. Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. This is Anne. I think that the answer to the question that you just raised depends very heavily on our assumption about whether other business beyond the election of Chair will need to be handled by this person or persons.

I think that what Lawrence was saying was absolutely, you know, it's a priority to get a Chair elected. But as Amr has pointed out, there are situations that

present time limits and, you know, can't - there can be, you know, urgent things to be considered.

So if - the question as I see it is if you believe that there must be other business that will have to be handled in addition to finalizing election of Chair, that might lead you away from, you know, a NonCom solution and more toward the designation of two Vice Chairs, one by each House and to happen quickly.

Because I think it's important that whatever procedure is in place be able to be implemented quickly and not be subject to an election and not be subject to the procedures that Julie outlined that can be time consuming.

So if our assumption is, you know, regular business at Council may need to be handled, then that causes me to lean very much toward designation of Vice Chair by each House. Thank you.

As a second, in other words, if there's a continuing Vice Chair not coming out of term, then I think that person should continue to serve and regardless of which House that person is from. Now again, that is not something I've run by my constituency. It's just my view that it's much simpler.

If both are leaving out of term as previously discussed, then if we assume that regular business of Council must be conducted in addition to election of Chair, then I would lean toward designation of two Vice Chairs, one by each House rather than going to the NonCom solution.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay. Thank you. Again, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes. By the way, the question was raised - Avri on the chat. Well how often we had a situation like this in the past? And I think this was the only one. I can also remember in Dublin that we had this problem that the Chair was not elected in the first round.

And I think in Dublin there was not a real problem because both Vice Chairs and (Volker) and (David) so far - was it (David)? They could continue because they were continuing members on the Council. So that was (solved) that problem.

So it could really come down a basic question just in case they are - both Vice Chairs are going to leave the Council as the AGM and the new Council Chair should be elected and then it's a problem what's going to happen then.

We also suppose - I understand it that way that the new Vice Chairs, which are going to be selected by the - by both Houses shall also only be elected after the Chair is elected in order to give all people a chance to run for Chair. This is what I also understand. Yes. Anne.

So it's really just the case when they both are going to leave. So what's your feeling with regards to the question of nominating or suggesting the non-voting NCA should take over that in comparison to the question of designation of interim Chairs from each House?

So I think this is the - that is what we come back with is that question. What's - with regards to this - the one person, the non-voting NCA regarding his so-called designation process. So that's what I would like to have some input from you and Amr please.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. This is Amr. Noting Anne's comment in the chat. I think it's a good idea to discuss indeed with the full committee and we'll have the opportunity to do that on Thursday during the SCI call.

But just an idea at the top of my head; it's not something I've thought about too much but I'm - it may or may not prove to be helpful if we come up with different scenarios, different solutions like the ones we've been discussing today.

Like for example, a mix between two or one Vice Chair that is not term limited and willing to continue and then designating new Vice - interim Vice Chairs and possibly the non-voting NonCom appointee as a Chair.

It may be worthwhile to maybe consider the order of desirability of each of one of these scenarios and then maybe perhaps adjust a staggered approach to dealing with a scenario like this. So if one - if the Council does find itself in the situation where again there's an inclusive Chair election, then they'd have the first option, which is one that the committee would be recommending.

And if that option for one reason or other doesn't work out, move to the second option, which is perhaps less desirable but still an option. And then a third and fourth and so on just to try to help create predictable scenarios where the Council understands with the failure of each one what the next steps may be. Again, that's just a thought. It's not something I considered too thoroughly but figured I'd just throw it out there. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thanks very much Amr. So let's take these - those questions to the SCI meeting on - it's probably on Thursday of this week. If I may tell you because I told you that I will be on a train and sometimes the connectivity is not the best one. But you all know it best, you know, these scenarios, these questions are in case I - my call is cut early. You can continue that discussion there.

Well, so let's do it this way. What was the - I had one more question to that. Oh yes, the question - the open question is Julie to you. Is it possible that we could refer to the NonCom just immediately, you know, after this call with a question Amr raised? You know, whether the NCA or the non-voting NCA - well let me turn the question this way.

Whether this could cause problems with regards to the NonCom's intentions by selecting an NCA - a non-voting NCA in case this NCA takes over as

interim Chair for the purpose of election plus replacing - or plus doing the job as long as a Chair is not available? So if you got this question, that's okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie. I'm just wondering if it's a little premature to ask that question because as I understood it - at least my takeaway as an action here is to order the scenarios by desirability. And that we're looking at the simplest, you know, sort of trying to move to what would be the simplest, you know, procedure in each case.

And so, you know, Case 1 is what happened in Dublin. So both Vice Chairs continue. If they can continue they do. And they manage the election. Or if only one is continuing, then that one continues. I think this what Anne had said too. That the preference is that Vice Chairs can continue.

Then three, if the two are not continuing, then each House designates and interim Vice Chair. Four would be sort of the last case scenario I would think, which would be non-voting NCA is designated as an interim Vice Chair. But I'm wondering whether or not we first want to have this discussion with the full SCI.

I'm also not entirely sure to whom I would direct this question for a quick response. I'd have to figure out - I mean it might actually even be a legal question as opposed to a NonCom question. So I might have to engage legal as well. I'm just not entirely sure.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Very well. I personally would agree well to do it that way. First discuss with SCI and the others. But I would like if you could do that, it would be helpful for the meeting for the SCI just to put these four points all together Julie if you have it on the screen at the SCI meeting and these options and then we can discuss it there. Anne, please.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Yes. Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. I admit to being ignorant on the question of whether there are different listed criteria for choosing the non-voting NCA

representatives. I wonder if that could simply look at whether the criteria, you know - I mean there are listed criteria aren't there for the NonCom representative? I thought there were; maybe there are not -- and whether there's any difference between the non-voting and the voting.

Without putting in an inquiry to the NonCom it might be good for us to just know what are the listed criteria for the non-voting member - selection of non-voting member.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thanks for the question Anne. Well, you know, with regards to the criteria, I don't think that we have specific criteria other - to think about other than saying well, it should be - and it seems to be the person which is less connected to any interested party I can say in this way regarding the Houses, well, with regards to the election.

You know, you're also discussing - I think somebody maybe Lawrence came up with the idea of why not just to take the one who served the longest term already on Council. Well, this is not - this we cannot do because we are all term limited. So we cannot take the eldest person, you know, on the - on Council. But that could be also criteria. Why not? You know.

So I think we shouldn't put too much thinking about that so which criteria we should use. Just think about, you know, which we have (rating) Councilors or how many, 14, 15 or so. And well, let's take one or two of them then. Okay. Julie, is that your hand still up?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Sorry Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. I just wanted to confirm I will go ahead and after this call send both to this group - just have - make sure - first to this group to make sure that I've captured the different scenarios correctly and the options. And then maybe ask for just a quick turnaround on that. And then I will prepare that to send to the SCI say by tomorrow.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So send it to us to our list and then you get a quick response I'm sure. Thank you. So let's finish that time. We have just four minutes left. So I'm sorry about that. For the timeline is also an important point.

I can only say, you know, I have put the timeline or sent it out to our list within our constituency. So far no response. No - not any comment regarding that. So I - while openly speaking I think they trust me. And asking myself what would be my further comment to that.

I'm asking you is there any comments from your side you want also to put that to discussion in your various constituencies; if there is more time needed, well, you should do so and take the time. Any comments to that?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Wolf-Ulrich. Hi. It's Anne. Just that we're losing some time here. So just very quickly has this timeline been reviewed by the full SCI because I am not supposed to send out to my constituency things that have not been reviewed by full SCI?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry. I did not get it. You mean...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Did the full SCI discuss this timeline?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, no. I didn't quite get it that you only can ask your constituency if that is - has been discussed with the full SCI or...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: The reason being that they want us to have, you know, consensus on our work for the purpose of, you know, saving time on the other end. And I'm just wondering if we could discuss the timeline at the fully SCI. And...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. We did it in - but all just for five minutes in Marrakech.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: You did it. Okay. That was my question. Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And there it was said okay. Well, there may be needed some more discussion within constituencies about that because depending, you know, on the timelines within those stakeholder groups and constituencies so and there was a requirement to come back if there is any need - any request from that side. So if you need some time to do so and ask it to your constituency, please do so.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Lawrence, please.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Yes. Lawrence for the records. We sent this out to the BC last week. That's Angie and I. And we've not gotten - we've only just gotten a response, which isn't directly connected to the timeline as it is.

But the question that we had raised when we were (unintelligible) communication to BC was how we arrived at the different dates. I remember that we talked about that. This is just a proposal. I know that. But looking at the 190 days, could it (unintelligible) in this? Could it be - are we looking at starting at (unintelligible) and starting to the AGM or just to have some more insight on how the timing is spread?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Lawrence for the question. I understand Julie that is the old plan coming from the last (cycle) last year. And the dates 29 June and they are at that time from June 2015 if I'm correct. Is that correct? Or is it - did you just - no. Well, okay. I think this time we have a meeting - the ICANN meeting shall be from 27th to 30th of June is at the B meeting for which I...

Julie Hedlund: Right. It's 27 as opposed to 29 - 26 to 29. Not sure where I - why I put 26 to 29. But what I used...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think it was from last year.

Julie Hedlund: You're right. I - what I meant to use was Meeting B for this year. So it'd be the 27th to the 30th. I can update that. But the point was that it was, you know, for 2017 and perhaps, you know, and I just sort of just picked the dates based on the way it happened last year that, you know, the announcement went out at the time of the - what is now the B meeting and then, you know, the timeline, you know, ticked off from there.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Julie, hi. This is Anne. So does that suggest that the timeline should actually specify a kickoff at the B meeting? Is there something that - a reason to tie it to either the end of the B meeting or...

Julie Hedlund: Oh yes. And actually and I see - Anne, thank you. This is Julie Hedlund. So, no. Actually I'm not looking at this year because there is an election this year. I'm looking at 2017 because we just had an election, right? So...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: And so...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right. So should the timeline say...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...twenty seventeen. The only reason I picked the B meeting as a start, you know, say for 2017 is just because that's the way it was done for the last election. The announcement was made at the GNSO Council meeting - at the end of the GNSO Council meeting in that summer meeting last year in 2015.

And so that would be a question is that the initiation point or do people want a different initiation point. That's just the way it happened to have happened before.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. That's Julie. Well, if you could update that for us because normally, you know, we are going also at the Council meeting. That way that this timeline is sent by Glen to the Council after that and it should contain all the data - the dates from this year. So if you could just check it and then and see.

Julie Hedlund: Actually though we don't have an election this year. So I used the dates for 2017. That's why they're different. That's why it's 26 to 29.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, normally the Council Chair is elected every year I understand.

Julie Hedlund: Every year?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...apologize for that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Yes, yes, yes, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's the question because we need it this year again. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I'll update it. Thank you. I'm not quite sure where my head was at. But thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So normally, you know, what happened over the last years is that the incumbent Chair has been re-elected. So that was not a big problem. So but there is an election this year. Okay. So if you can just update that a little bit and would be helpful.

So we run out of time a little bit. I would suggest well, for this I understand we need some more time within the constituencies. I will also ask again to my constituencies. I personally do not have a problem with that. But if I could get some comments next time from you, that will be helpful.

We could also present it to the overall SCI on the 24th June - Julie. So that would be helpful. And well, then directly put the question to all of the attendees. So well the last question here is right now. We need another meeting after the SCI meeting. Shall we do that next week? That okay? Same time?

Man: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No objection? Amr, please.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. This is Amr. I was wondering if maybe we should pose this question to the committee as a whole; ask them whether they would like a subteam to continue with its work or whether the committee would like to take over working on this in full or not. Just suggestion. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, to get it right Amr. You mean on the next SCI meeting we should pose the question whether they would like to have an extension of our task here to discuss it or whether the SCI as a whole should discuss this process in the future and then directly? Was that - that was your question.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. That's suggested.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is that okay? Okay.

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Yes. I figured on Thursday we ask them whether they would like the subteam to continue or whether they would like to take over and...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: ...participate directly in the (unintelligible). Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Good. Then let's ask the session on the next SCI meeting. But...

Angie Graves: Excuse me please. This is Angie Graves. I'm very sorry (unintelligible) for 1 o'clock instead of 12:00. Just offering...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I understand you Angie. I did the same last time. I think so. Thank you.
We were just over.

Angie Graves: Thank you. I'll catch up on email.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: We were just almost over and thinking about well, let's keep on hold a date for next week just in case well the SCI would not take over. So let's keep the date for next week same time. Anne, last question please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Just very quickly Wolf-Ulrich. I think that whatever timeline we put together should be one that essentially works every year. In other words, if it's a standard procedure to be established, for example, could we, you know, say that the announcement of proposed procedure and timeline is triggered by that GNSO Council meeting in the B meeting and then have all the other dates, you know, follow from that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Is there a way to standardize the timeline...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...each year. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Good proposal. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Also (unintelligible). I'll just note though that it can't work because the dates - as far as I can tell, the dates for the meetings change. So the number of days between each element or each milestone would necessarily - at least from the first milestone in June to the, you know, June to the first milestone would never be the same.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Julie, that's correct. The question is do we need all the dates, you know, here. If we just counted days starting with the timeline from last year. So I understand that it is - it's going to vary because of the variation of the meeting schedule itself. But the question is is it okay well to start in general with the B meeting. Is that - this question should be asked.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Well we could start with the B meeting but then I don't really know how to set milestones because then if we have to...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...with the AGM, that will always change as well. So I'm not quite sure how to do it I guess is my problem.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. And let's discuss next time though whether to follow, you know, the upper line or the lower line in counting just days. And then it may happen before or after the (ECB) meeting. Could be. Yes. Let's ask this question next time.

Julie Hedlund: That sounds good. And I'll update the (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good. Thank you very much for your time and for the discussion today.
And we will meet again on 24th...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Goodbye.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you very much. Bye bye.

Woman: Bye everyone. Thank you.

Man: Thank you all. Goodbye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting's been adjourned. Operator please stop the recordings.

END