

**ICANN Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation WG
Thursday, 19 May 2016 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation Working Group call on Thursday, 19 May 2016 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-19may16-en.mp3>

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

Michelle Desmyter: All right thanks (Christine). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation Working Group call on the 19th of May at 1800 UTC.

On the call today we do have Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. Amr Elsadr, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Angie Graves, Lori Schulman. And we do have apologies from Sara Bockey and Rudy Vansnick. From staff we have Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund and myself Michelle Desmyter. I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. I'd like to turn the call to you Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great. Thank you. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. And Rudy our chair not able to attend today and asked me to chair the call which I'm happy to do. We are looking at what Julie has posted in connection with the revised proposed operating procedures for officer elections governing chair and vice chairs. And these are procedures we've been

working in our subgroup and in our full group to address situations where no chair is conclusively elected.

And I believe that after our last call two weeks ago there were some additional comments on this draft in particular by Amr that for clarification and that those were certainly positively commented on by those on the list. If possible Amr I would like to ask you to review the changes that you had suggested for clarification just so everyone is on the call is on the same page about that. Would you be willing to do that Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Hi Anne, thanks. This is Amr. Are you referring to the bracketed language under 2.2.1 numbers two and three the bracketed languages in red?

Anne Aikman-Scalase: Yes I think the red Julie is that correct that the red line reflects the changes that were made after Amr's comments? Is that...

Julie Hedlund: Right. Well so just this is Julie Hedlund from staff. So the red line reflects a couple of things. First of all the redline indicates the text that is new to the current procedures of the current GNSO operating procedures. And so this is the whole new section relating to the chair vice chair election and as well as some of the changes, you know, in the current section of officer elections 2.2 where, you know, reflecting the discussions in the SCI and agreement on language for example in 2.2B the second sentence now reads a candidate for GNSO Council chair does not need to be a member of a house but must be a current or incoming member of the GNSO Council.

And then there's a few changes down in F. You can scroll through and note those also reflecting the agreements concerning language in the group. And then there's the whole new 2.2.1 procedures for dealing with a situation where a new GNSO chair has not been elected by the end of the previous chairs term. And so the language in one color is essentially the language that the SCI had agreed to but now put into the format, the appropriate format for the GNSO operating procedures and, you know, and then in some of the red

lines reflect staff adding text just to be consistent with the format that is used in the GNSO operating procedures.

And then in number two and three in the new section in brackets at the end of two and three is the language suggested by Amr should the vacant house sale to appoint an interim vice chair within the allotted time period the continuing vice chair from the other house will serve as an interim vice chair alone until a new chair is conclusively elected. And that also is appended to three. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay yes. And so it's that bracketed language that I think that Amr I was just wanting to make sure that you made the comment on because I saw your list - and this is Anne again for the transcript. I saw your post to the list that you felt from listening to our last MP3 of our last call that you thought there had been a little confusion about what issue you were raising. So I wanted to make sure that, you know, you had a chance to express that and to talk about your suggested language in the brackets there which it seems that there's, you know, agreement on. But I noted that in your post on the list you said you thought maybe we were all a little confused about the point that you were raising.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Anne this is Amr. Yes I don't recall who it was but when listening to the recording in the last SCI call I thought someone has suggested that the outcome of points two or three may be in question with concerning the language we had here. And reading the language I agreed I thought that they were a bit ambiguous. Without the bracketed language - and I don't believe that I've actually added anything with suggesting this language because I think that that's what we had originally as a committee sort of agreed on how the different data sort of progress.

But I did think it would be helpful to just have clarifying text in there just to make sure that folks who were reading for example 2.2.1, number two where if there's one vice chair who has - who's term is ending at the same time as

the chair and no chair is conclusively elected then if one - if the house with the missing vice chair failed to appoint an interim vice chair I was concerned that folks reading the language may think that okay so there's - since one house failed to appoint an interim vice chair then we would need to move on to another stage. And obviously three would have worked so we might have to move forward to Stage IV.

But I don't believe that that was our intent when we drafted those. So I just figured it would be helpful to add this language that makes it clear but if one house and the house would be missing vice chair or the vacant vice chair seats that if they failed to appoint an interim vice chair in the time that we have prescribed for this appointment then the already present vice chair would continue as an interim vice chair to manage the second round of council chair elections. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you Amr. And I see that Lori raised her hand. Perhaps she has a common on that. Lori?

Lori Schulman: Yes can you hear me?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Barely.

Lori Schulman: Can you hear me? Okay can you hear me better now?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Lori Schulman: Okay yes. I'm sorry my microphone is very far away from my screen. I apologize. Yes I actually agree with Amr. Not actually, I agree with Amr's point because what concerned me that if that chair if either house couldn't decide on an interim chair that then it would slow down the work of the council. And I think if there's that much dissension we should just go ahead with one leader to keep work flowing rather than tie everybody up into knots.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay great. Thank you Lori. Are there others who would like to comment on this? It does seem to be that there is a consensus developing on that point. But I certainly would like to see, you know, if let's do it this way. I see some agrees in the chat. Can we all give a check if we're agreeing for are you able if you're in Adobe to agree with this and by way of a check? Oh lovely, I'm seeing all manner and variety of checkmarks. I see Wolf-Ulrich also check marked. So thank you. I think we would call that a consensus.

I personally have one more question in relation to this and we can clear our agrees now. But how do we within ICANN compute calendar days? I guess this is a question I would put to staff or anyone else with experience, you know, noting that there's a time deadline here and that things something is triggered if it's not met, you know, we continue with the one interim vice chair and that the deadline is expressed as 14 calendar days do – what time zone are we using? And Wolf-Ulrich I see your hand is up so I'll ask you to comment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you (unintelligible). No it's related to - my comment is related to the table with the timescale so it's different. So you are asking for the 14 calendar days. So I understand calendar days yes in terms of how the calendar days the current we are (unintelligible) as usual. I don't know any other calendar. I know there are other calendars here that are being used around the world but usually I think internationally by that is the annual beginning from the January to the 31st December. And 14 days of that is 14 calendar days. That's my understanding. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. I guess my question was a little bit different and I see that Julie has her hand up because of course, you know, the end of May 19 in Australia occurred a while ago. And so I'm - that's my question. Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Anne. This is Julie Hedlund. I - we have expressed in these procedures first of all I should note calendar days as opposed to business

days. So that means we count the days sequentially, you know, in, you know, the calendars that basically all of us are accustomed to using. The difference is that if there is a deadline that's expressed such as the submission of a motion that is to be ten calendar days prior to a GNSO Council meeting the deadline is expressed as 2359 UTC.

So to the extent that a time is needed to be referenced for a, you know, deadline, you know, a deadline, a certain deadline then UTC is the time that is used. Otherwise the time zone is not expressly - it is not expressly linked in calendar days. I think it would be assumed that the calendar would apply to you wherever, you know, wherever one was and that that there would be a time deadline only when one is needed.

So with respect to the election timeline then I guess the SCI would need to ask, you know, do we need to express a time? So for instance, you know, we're starting at the ICANN meeting well frankly we may not know the timing of the GNSO Council meeting at the ICANN meeting. We do - we could express say for the deadline the P in the table a time again though we may not know the exact timing so we're just mentioning a day as opposed to linking it to UTC.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thanks Julie. I guess in the interest of clarity I don't think that that 14 calendar days should depend on where the ICANN meeting occurs. It kind of seems to me that it ought to be, you know, 2359 14 calendar days following the day of the council meeting. I don't know do others have ideas as to how to express that efficiently? Wolf-Ulrich go ahead please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks Anne. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I'm wondering whether this is a let me say a critical date to be so exact, you know, which requires, you know, an exact statement about that. You know, usually on councils so we have deadlines or motions as well. And it's also counted in calendar days.

So it's usually as Julie says, you know, the date from in 20s in 2359 UTC but I would say there's a tight kind of flexibility behind that. So in case there's somebody, you know, coming some hours later to them and saying okay there was this and that or this reason so nobody really cares about that and this, you know, that wouldn't be an issue. So I'm asking myself whether we should be more clear in that and more precise than it is right now? Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. I guess my experience with that - this is Anne again is a little different. My experience with respect to submission of motions has been that it was important to specify the exact time for the ten days prior. And that we as SCI is a group worked on unanimous waivers if a motion was not submitted timely and helped to develop the language for that which was then adopted by the council.

What concerns me here is that we do have a provision that says, you know, if you don't appoint your interim vice chair on - in time you continue with the one vice chair in the other house or whatever. And that seems to be something that is potentially even more important than timely submission of motions to some of the members of the various houses. So my feeling would be that the calculation of that deadline needs to be very, very clear. See, I think Julie had her hand up and then Wolf-Ulrich again. Go ahead Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Anne. Hi Anne. This is Julie Hedlund. So I'm just looking in the current operating procedures of what we say for motions again to remind myself. Says reports and motions should be submitted to the GNSO Council for inclusion on the agenda as soon as possible but no later than 23 hours 59 coordinated universal time. And then I'm just looking for, you know, if it submitted after the deadline yes there are as you noted, you know, several, you know, requirements that apply.

So then looking back at what we have here I guess the question to the SCI members is instead of saying say for example in number to the deadline for the vacant house to designate its interim vice chair is 14 calendar days

following the council meeting do we then feel we need to say it used the same language. So say, you know, as we say with motions should be - I just lost my spot. Yes should be then no later than 23 hours 59 coordinated Universal Time 14 days prior, 14 calendar days following the council meeting? I guess that's my question.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes Julie I would certainly support that formulation just because it gives clarity and people rather - and this is Anne again. Rather than saying well exactly what, you know, what is the time limit mean? There is so much work going on within ICANN and some of these deadlines, you know, I feel that people need real clarity on what a true deadline is in something like this. But Wolf-Ulrich go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks Anne, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well now I understood better the issue, you know? In the context of the question whether one or two vice chairs should continue to work. Well for me here's the question.

So in case we come to that point that one vice chair is just designated and the other not interim vice chair does it does this mean that the other house, you know, which couldn't designated a vice chair is - should be excluded until the election to come up with a better vice chair so or does it mean that just the business should start with preparing for the election by one of the vice chairs? But if the other house is in the position in-between they could designate a vice chair as well.

So it could overcome that issue if we - I you understand it this way. So that's my question and because if you exclude, you know, how it's then okay then it's over. You have no chance whether (unintelligible) is named on another interim vice chair. Then I understand and I would agree too that we have to be very exactly. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I see, thanks Wolf-Ulrich. You're raising a question sorry.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Sorry this is Lawrence. I'd like to be placed on the queue please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sure Lawrence. Go ahead.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Okay, thank you. This is Lawrence for the record. I feel listening to, you know, this discussion I feel might help us if we go that step further to put the time of the day, you know, the 300 hours to help clear any ambiguity. The reason is I'm looking at our (unintelligible) 14 days, you know, after the AGN. And then could also be - that may also be transcribed to mean that immediately after the AGM held whether it ended at some 4:00 pm or 6:00 pm in the local time of wherever it was the meeting held that 14 hours - I mean 14 days after that particular time is when the timing will have - should have lapsed.

So in order for us not to create any room for augmenting in the future I feel that we could - it could help us a lot if we define the particular hour, you know, that we expect such a time limit to lapse. And I think that the best is ought to go with, you know, the 2359 UTC. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay so I think we have two different issues -- and this is Anne again -- that are being raised. I think Lawrence that you are saying that the timing should be tied to the location where the actual meeting occurs is that correct, rather than just using UTC or what's it called commercial...

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: No what I'm saying - yes, now the issue that - what I'm saying that is possible for it to be interpreted this way. And so in order for us not to create room for argument in the future it's possible to say that because the meeting held at the particular time or ended a particular time than 14 calendar days after should also end at that particular time.

So in other (unintelligible) who have worried any - any not to create any room for confusion in the future it's better when we say the 14 calendar days that we also specify the time. So that's why I'm saying that I'm in agreement that

we should put or we should include the time in the language, you know, like so that like has been suggested let's in a few days to the (unintelligible) that 14 calendar days at so, so time which is 2359 UTC let's define the time so that we do not create room for arguments in future. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh, okay great. Thanks. I understand there what you're saying Lawrence and I think several have commented in the chat that that's okay. And I think though the Wolf-Ulrich raises a little bit different question. I think that what he may be saying is that a failure by one house to meet these deadlines of 14 calendar days should we consider or discuss whether that house should be allowed to go ahead and appoint an interim vice chair after the deadline anyway to help conduct business in-between the - that period in time and the final conclusive election of a chair?

I guess my own thoughts about that Wolf-Ulrich would be that it might tend to cause people to procrastinate and that the reason that we would have this 14 calendar day deadline would be to, you know, ensure that a choice, you know, does get made in a timely fashion so that business may proceed. I sort of like the definiteness of the rule as it is but I don't know if others have a comment on whether it would just be fine for a vacant vice chair to be appointed at any time afterward and what the effect of that might be? Do I have your question correctly phrased Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Anne. Mostly I think so because my intention was to overcome that lag that, you know, or that case that one of the houses couldn't appoint a vice chair or, you know, or (unintelligible) that way, you know, after 14 calendar days definite business should be started to be conducted, you know, either by one or by two interim vice chairs. So in case there's only one he should start or she should start to conduct this business.

But to overcome, you know, this issue well of having appointed a vice chair at exactly a certain hour or minute let me say there should be a chance to be given to that house who has still discussions, may have discussions well to

continue internal discussion and come later with that - with this vice chair, with this interim vice chair but under the condition that the business has already - could already been started by one vice chair. And that's my - that's what I have to say, want to be saying. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: So do we have others who have thoughts on that possibility of the let's call it a late appointment of an interim vice chair and what role that person would then have in conducting business in scenario two for example?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Lawrence would like to say something please.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes go ahead Lawrence.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: All right thank you again. This is Lawrence for the record again. I fully understand the angle Wolf-Ulrich is coming from. It's possible that maybe a process has started and because of a few hitches they - a particular house may have not been able to conclude the selection process before or within the 14 days' timeframe.

But if we were to accommodate that it could also have some effect on the election process because I mean if we have - if we give 14 days for a house to come up with an alternative for a vice chair position it means that roughly even if it's 30 or 31 calendar days, you know, we are looking at maybe some 16 thereabouts or 17 days to start the process I mean to work towards, you know, concluding some form of by election.

And so if we've given half of the time, if we've given half of that time for, you know, for that selection to be to have put in place and it's not concluded I feel that like Anne is saying if we extend or we don't cause the houses to want to get into this timeframe it will not - it might only drawback a - it might not only (unintelligible) on this election or the election process, it will also mean that we - might also mean that there shouldn't even have been a 14 day timeframe on the initial instance.

So knowing that, you know, there is going to be a consequence if they're not able to fill that gap in good time might also put pressure on, you know, the relevant house to quickly finalize the process of selecting someone so standing as an interim chair. I feel that in my opinion I think we should go ahead to maintain the language the way it's structured and hope that, you know, the timeframe the tightness and all that will cost the relevant house to quickly select someone because that's the essence of all of these checks in the first instance. Thank you.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Thank you very much Lawrence. I'm seeing a comment from Amr in the chat. He would have some concern that a house would take more time to make its selection when other important things are happening. And then Julie is saying we would not need to put something in the procedures. Oh I am very sorry folks. I'm going to have to actually take this call. It's from a physician. I'm sorry - oops well there it went okay. No, waiting for news of a family member. I'm sorry. I will call them back. I'm not sure where to go with this right now. Wolf-Ulrich are you still feeling strongly that this language should be added to permit the appointment of an interim vice chair later in the process?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks Anne, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. No not so keen about it. If you find a version, you know, a solution, you know, of that is specifying (unintelligible) in exact way why not so then everybody knows exactly what to do and knows okay this is the deadline and nothing else. So I'm in favor of that so just, you know, in case if there is a feeling a little bit more flexibility should be given then let's talk about it but I'm not really - well I'm not - well I can live with both.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. Let me ask this question. We were on our last call -- and this is Anne again -- discussing the possibility of reviewing these revised procedures with council before I think - I don't know if that was the notion of that was getting their input before or after a consensus call within SCI. And, you know, maybe this is one of the things as we look at the procedure that we

would want to seek, you know, the council's comments before we make a formal recommendation.

So I saw Julie's hand go up and I also then saw Lori's hand go up. So who wants to go first?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie just for a quick clarification. At our last call we did agree that we would like to have consensus on the proposed revision to the GNSO operating procedures before bringing this to the council in Helsinki at their next meeting. And so the thought was that after today's call if it was possible and if it was agreed to on this call then staff would, you know, except the changes and prepare the language for a consensus call.

And I just one other thing that I just wanted to point out with respect to Amr's, you know, comments, you know, saying in particular the important issue here would be that the council business not be delayed it seems that the current language gives the most forcefulness or shall we say the most support for or guards most against delay I mean and that it doesn't really give any wiggle room if one attaches the, you know, the hour in UTC time if as I can tell whereas if we put in more language that allows flexibility then in my personal opinion we've seen that more flexibility we've rolled in the more possibility that conceivably that could be used for delay. Oops and I meant to lower my hand not raise it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thanks Julie. I would tend to agree with you. Go ahead Lori.

Lori Schulman: Oh hi. I agree absolutely that we shouldn't ever delay council business but I have a different opinion about appointing an interim vice chair after the deadline. Then why have a deadline? I don't understand why we would have a deadline then if meeting a deadline doesn't - isn't consequential in any real way?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right. Lori I think actually we've heard several comments that agree with your point of view on that because I think that's what, you know, I hear Lawrence saying. I think that's also my point of view. I don't think that either Wolf-Ulrich or Amr are really objecting to leaving the language the way that it is. If I'm wrong about that then...

Lori Schulman: Yes maybe I'm not understanding. I - sometimes I get confused, you know, I apologize for my confusion because I thought in the chat Amr said that he wouldn't mind a late appointment as long as business isn't delayed but I don't understand how those reconciled that's all.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes I think I, you know, and I see here Amr saying comment to me that I'm not wrong about where he's coming from. You know, it's I think it's just a question of, you know, having clarity in the rules and there's a reason for the deadline and that and in fact just, you know, encourages people to make a timely appointment. And Amr is saying that he in the chat that he would also have some of the concerns that you have stated.

So to me it kind of looks like we're at the stage where we need to decide whether with the change on the computation of calendar days inserted in there can we reach an agreement on this point and move on to Wolf-Ulrich's comments on the table? If you are against that please raise your hand? Otherwise we're going to go ahead and move on. Lori go ahead.

Lori Schulman: No, no I just lowered my hand.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh okay. You're lowering your hand. Okay so I think we'll go ahead and move on asking staff to make appropriate change with respect to the listing of a deadline as being tied to the 2359 to make it clear and then move on to woeful Rick comments regarding the table. Go ahead Wolf-Ulrich. Hello?

Wolf-Ulrich Knob: Sorry Anne, do you hear me?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Now we hear you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh sorry. I was microphone off. While reading the table I'm wondering the third calendar maximum duration to what it's - it should be good for? That's my question. How it is phrased right now? It seems to be it says okay we use one day for example for the houses to submit nominees in one day. Well what does it say? Tell us, you know. For me the question is more how much time the house is given well to come up with the nominees. And that - if that's the duration can we see that anyway here? So that's my question. I don't see, you know, a real reason for this third column here and how it expresses, you know, gives us value to somebody who reads it. You know, and that's my own question here. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay just to be clear I do believe we have moved on to a completely different subject and we're not talking about appointment or election or anything of any interim vice chairs. We're talking here about specifying a timeline for the election of a chair. Is that correct Julie and can you lead us through this section? Go ahead Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Anne. This is Julie Hedlund. Yes so and thank you for that note Wolf-Ulrich. I copied actually a format that was used in the operating procedures that related to another election. It was the - I'm just trying to pull it out here but I - at any rate this - let me say that this format had been used previous in - oh here I have it, just looking through one of the previous versions. Okay so this was the - this is in Section 24 on board seat elections activities timeline on under timing.

And it is said, you know, we started out later than, you know, and then you had T minus and in this case they're talking months and weeks not days, you know, what was the activity that commenced and then the maximum duration? I simply just copied that format. I don't know that it's necessarily a

good one and I take your point that it may indeed not add anything at all and perhaps we may want to just leave off that column.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: This is Anne. I would like to ask Julie before I recognize Wolf-Ulrich that you walk us through, you know, those on the call that first of all you confirm that this is a table that applies to the chair election and that you walk us through what each column means. I don't think I am fully following how this works. So could you just go over what this table means and confirm that it's talking about chair election?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is the - this is talking about chair elections. And it relates to a request that the SCI had made to staff to come up with a timeline, a generic timeline. As you may recall there was a graphic, a PowerPoint slide the staff have produced that had both, you know, dates leading up to the next annual general meeting for instance but also then the sort of generic timeline, you know, T minus X number of days, et cetera. And there was some discussion over, you know, what did we use as a starting and what did we use as the ending.

I think that the agreement was but others can correct me if I'm wrong that the ending, the T is the election held at the annual general meeting and backing up to that is the summer meeting understanding that that date varies. And so there is no data associated with that because it will be different. So starting at the top of the table we have the summer ICANN meeting where the proposed procedure for the election and the timeline is announced. That happens on one day. And then...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No let me just - I'm sorry Julie let me just ask a question from that. One day from the GNSO council meeting or one day from the beginning of the ICANN meeting or one day from when?

Julie Hedlund: Well see so this is where I think maybe Wolf-Ulrich is making I think a useful point. Perhaps having the third column is not helpful. So the point in putting in

maximum duration is that the GNSO Council meeting happens on a day. I suppose a GNSO Council meeting could happen over two days in which case this would be even more confusing. But the idea is that there is a day no more than a day for the announcement to happen for the proposed procedure and timeline meaning really shouldn't take any longer than a day for that to happen and it would happen during the summer ICANN meeting.

Then once that happens then clock starts ticking 60 days prior to the election held at the annual general meeting, the NonCom selectee is announced and the nominee selection begins and there are 30 days for the nominee selection. Then the houses submit their nominees so 30 days had passed so now we're a T minus 30. Then the candidate statements are due T minus 18. And this is also based on the way elections have been conducted in the past so it may be that we want to change those timelines than at T minus 3 candidate meetings are held and that is the assumption that these candidate meetings are held at a ICANN meeting. T is the election held at the annual general meeting. T Plus 2 is the requirement that the procedures that that council must inform the board and community and post-election results no more than two days after an election is held.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay many thanks Julie. And I guess, you know, what we all need to understand is that T means the day that the election's held at the annual general meeting. Okay so Wolf-Ulrich go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes thanks Anne. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well Julie this table is very good for understanding and that's what all we need, you know, to have table shown easier in that form or in the matrix or as we used to have, you know, on a timeline, you know, this one but this helps. And especially the first two columns are the one very clear. You know, the second one is the action what is going to be to be done and the other one is counted back forward from the day of the election so that's clear.

So the question for me is here obviously got to column one could we insert an information showing to the actors, the different actors here how many days they have available to act? So for example how many days the houses have including the stakeholder groups and constituencies have, how many days they have time to nominate the - their candidates? I read that this way that now they have 30 days after the announcement of the NonCom.

And then after 30 days they have - they will have the - to provider to submit the nominees. And then okay there is a time of I counted that way said 12 days until for the candidates to provide their statements. So that's what I would like to say here to see here. Can it (unintelligible) 12 day time well to provide their statements? You can deduct it from that 13 minus 18 so in the first column that is 12 days so that was my question. That information would be more useful to my mind rather than for the candidate has just one day to provide his statement.

He sees as one day well what does he mean? Does he have one day to provide the statement or does it just mean okay there is one fixed day where he has to send this statement? That's, you know, what are the different what I see here. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Julie is your hand up again or is that an old hand?

Julie Hedlund: Hi Anne. This is Julie Hedlund. I was going to respond to see if I understood what Wolf-Ulrich is suggesting and how I might incorporate that into the table and also recognize in the comments from Amr.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great go ahead Julie.

Julie Hedlund: So Wolf-Ulrich I understand now what you're asking and I think that actually it makes much more sense. But I'm wondering if it could still be a third column. I think you had mentioned it in the first column. But what if, you know, I mean

what if - in some cases it doesn't really apply so let's say under maximum duration -- and perhaps we call it something else -- there would not need to be a value say where announced proposed procedure and timeline because there isn't an extended amount of time to do that nor that the NonCom selectees are announced. But the house nominee selection would need to happen in 30 days.

The house submitting nominees then I mean, you know, would follow but it doesn't have to happen over a span of days. But I understand the candidate statements they would have yes as you say, you know, 12 days to provide their statements whereas the candidates would have two days to do their meetings. That would still be true but maybe, you know, in an instance where something is happening on a day it doesn't have to be indicated whereas, you know, if something has two days or more or maybe it has to be indicated. I'm just trying to think about the best way for me to betray this that makes sense. So happy to listen to any suggestions there.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great, thanks Julie. I'm - I'd like to suggest that there could be some further discussion between Julie and Wolf-Ulrich after the close of this call to clarify that table. I think a couple of things I'll mention in the chat. Both Amr and Lori commented could we label this, you know, chair elections timeline even, you know, that that might help somewhat. I'm seeing yeses on that.

And the other thing that I need to address in terms of the procedure for this meeting is that I utterly failed in my duties to chairing the call to do a roll call and call for any changes to statements of interest. So I will ask that staff take the roll call from the Adobe Connect and then Lawrence came in by phone. Are there any others who are in by phone and have not made their presence known please do so now And then I do need to ask in sort of very bad order, reverse order are there any updates to statements of interest that need to be disclosed?

Okay very good, at least I got rid of that. So at this point I do think it would be helpful for Julie to go back and make some other changes that have been discussed during this meeting and for Julie and Wolf-Ulrich to continue to talk about the table and maybe put something out to the list. But I want to recognize Wolf-Ulrich's hand up in this regard. Go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Anne, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I would like to just do - to raise some point here. You know, you see that nominee selection is for - is for 30 days. So I think it should be discussed within the different constituencies and sort of on stakeholder groups whether this is the time we would like to have is that enough because we have to take into consideration that we would like to take into consideration as well the incoming new counselors which just have been announced, you know, one day before. Nobody knows. They may not know them too as it used to be the last time but if they should be taken into consideration so there should be some time, you know, we're able to get them known before the nominees are going to be submitted.

So that's just the question. So I would for my personal point of view if we take that into consideration so from the beginning so I would say it's enough. But it would mean that you consider this should if they want - would like to do so immediately start to get in contact with councilors to get familiar with them and discuss internally whether that this one could be candidates or not so that's just my comment on that. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Now Wolf-Ulrich could I ask you to restate that? You would like for each of us to go back to our constituencies to discover - to discuss whether the 30 day period is long enough or have I understood you correctly?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well I would say we should be aware what is to be done within those 30 days and from this point should be clear, you know, is it enough or not? So it's not if you say for your constituencies you have discussed that or you thought, you know, it might be enough so because you are aware of these

issues and then it's okay. You know, it was just from my point of view I - a point, you know, to be raised. Thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. And thanks Wolf-Ulrich. Now would it be from your point of view sufficient to raise that question after we develop a consensus on this document and then send it to our constituencies for the consensus call or is it something that you wanted us to raise separately?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh no we could do that. So during...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...sending out the to the consensus call just mention it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay very good. So then also in terms of timing and I do want us to get the call wrapped up here I anticipate that we will need to review another draft which would mean a call I think in another two weeks. And if we follow through with the timing my question is if we do a call in another two weeks and hopefully Rudy is able to chair would we at that point be able to put this out for consensus if we all agree on a final draft and still somehow get on GNSO Council's schedule for discussion purposes?

And this would I gather this would be prior to putting this out for public comment. So if someone on staff could help with the procedural timeline here I would appreciate it. Yes Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Hi. Thank you Anne. And I'll just note too that I do plan on making the changes people have suggested, you know, accepting the - noting the new text today relating to the timing, the 2359 UTC in two and three, you know, accepting the bracketed text from Amr. And then with respect to timing so the next call would be the 2nd of June. If we were to put the document out for a consensus call for the usual two-week time say starting 2nd of June through

the 16th of June there would still be time for a consensus call to be completed prior to the Helsinki meeting.

The Council meeting at Helsinki will be on the 30th counting back from their ten days one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten we would still have time. I mean there would not be a motion associated with so technically we, you know, motions and documents we would really like to get this before them by the motions and document deadline because it's a document but not a motion. And staff can work to get this on the GNSO Council's agenda. (Mary) is helping to pull that together. So yes it appears if we allow one more discussion at our next meeting we should be able to make the timing.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh excellent news. Thanks so much Julie. So unless I hear any objections that's how we'll proceed from here and hopefully we won't have any big conflicts in the call for two weeks from now. You know, is there anybody who's already knows they would not be able to make that call in two weeks? Oh good that's great news. Well I want to thank you all for your time. I'm sure we all have other issues we need to get onto. I see Julie's hand. Is that a new hand Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Old dead hand. Thanks...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Old dead hand, okay. Well I'd like to thank you all for your time and that's the plan as to how we will proceed from here so appreciate all the comments and all the participation. And thank you all for your time and energies for the SCI and everybody have a good rest of your day.

((Crosstalk))

Michelle Desmyter: Thank you everyone. Have a wonderful day morning evening or afternoon.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: We are adjourned. Thanks all.

END