

ICANN Transcription  
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation WG  
Thursday 21 April 2016 at 1800 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee On Improvements Implementation call on the Thursday 21 April 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/gns0/gns0-sci-21apr16-en.mp3>

**Attendees:**

Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC – Primary – Vice Chair  
Amr Elsadr – NCUC – Primary  
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC –Primary –Chair  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP – Primary  
Renata Aquino Ribeiro – NCUC - Alternate  
Angie Graves – BC – Primary  
Sara Bockey – RrSG – Primary  
Karel Douglas – NCSG – Alternate

**Apologies:**

None

**ICANN Staff:**

Mary Wong  
Glen de saint Gery  
Julie Hedlund  
Michelle DeSmyter

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thanks, (Kristine). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation meeting on the 21st of April, at 1800 UTC.

On the call today we do have Rudi Vansnick, Sara Bockey, Amr Elsadr, Angie Graves. We have apologies tentatively from Wolf-Ulrich Knoben who will be joining later into the call. And from staff we have Glen de Saint G ry, 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 Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Michelle. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. Welcome to this call today where we will have three important items to handle and as regularly I need to ask if there are any changes (unintelligible). And I don't think so as far as I can see who is on the call. I don't see any changes has happened as mentioned here. A lot of you probably don't (unintelligible) – I didn't see any apologies for Anne Aikman-Scalsese.

I remember at the last call – our previous call Anne Aikman-Scalsese had a problem with the (unintelligible). I'm just wondering if staff could eventually trigger Anne Aikman-Scalsese to see if she is available. She is online and check if there is no problem again with the time zone because she came at the end of the meeting due to the problem with the time zone.

So let's move on with our agenda. We have in fact we have today the closing date for the full consensus call on the GNSO Operating Procedures proposed revision relating to the motions and amendments. And I received a note from Amr with a request to eventually extend the date – the deadline to the 26 of April in order to allow having some discussions and perhaps, Amr, you could explain some reasoning for that.

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

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. Yeah, this is actually a mix up on my part. I had sent an email out I think the next day after the – after Julie had circulated the initial consensus call on list to the NCUC list. But the email seems to have gotten stuck in my outbox for a while and I was offline for a while and hadn't noticed. So I apologize. I did circulate email to the NCUC, I just figured it'd be nice to give them a few days to comment on any of the work the SCI had done before declaring consensus on the constituency's part.

I don't normally hear back much on the work of the SCI. I think folks are generally happy with what the committee produces. But I just figured I'd ask for a few extra days of there's any reason why this cannot be done or shouldn't be done it's not that big a deal I think. But thanks for considering anyway.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. Rudi for the transcript. Well I think it wouldn't be bad so that the 26th adjustment, just a week – Tuesday if I'm not wrong. And that doesn't change too much. We are not extending it for another week or it's not that big question to me. Yes, Amr, I see you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Rudi. This is Amr again. Before the SCI agrees to this I was wondering because I didn't calculate the time required for public comment periods on the changes the SCI recommending and taking that into account in terms of submission of a motion to the GNSO Council in time for the 10 day deadline before a Council meeting.

So if this does delay the process in any way I'd like to know because I may reconsider asking for the extension. But, yeah, I haven't thought that through. And to answer Julie's question in the chat, I think what I asked on this for was the until the 25th which is Monday so if the deadline could be extended to April 25 that would be great, assuming it doesn't cause any delays with a motion being submitted to the Council in time. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. Rudi for the transcript. Yeah, sorry, I was wrong, it was the 25th that you were proposing. I'm just mixing up the 26th as there was a discussion in the RPM when to have the next call. Julie, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Thank you, Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund for the record. So I'll just raise something for the SCI to consider. So obviously we have the call for consensus now on these particular revisions to the GNSO Operating Procedures. If indeed we agree, and it seems like we are coming close to agreement that there would be also changes relating to the chair/vice chair elections it might be a cleaner and more efficient process if we were able to do one public comment period.

And I think we have done this before where we've put all of the agreed upon changes out there, so in this case it would be both, you know, for the current consensus call relating to motions and amendments and then also the changes that staff of course would need to draft and the SCI would need to approve.

Assuming that the was the case then both could go out for public comment and then both could go to the Council for a motion. So that's just something for the SCI to consider as far as timing. I don't think there is a rush on either of these particular items to which I'm aware anyway.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Rudi for the transcript. Yeah, well I think it is indeed a good idea of separating the two issues and having separate public comment periods so that we can handle what comes in in a decent way. I do not expect a lot of comments on the first issue, the change of the procedures, but probably there will be quite some comments coming from – for the chair/vice chair elections. That will probably have more impact.

But if we want to respect the deadlines for having the public comment period being before – 10 days before the next Council – the Council meeting, do we

still stick to that timing? I don't have the calendar in front of me. Julie, can you help me out here?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund for the record. So I think, and Mary could correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the usual amount of time – minimum amount of time for the public comment period is – oh I should know this off the top of my head...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I think I mean, I think generally it's been 30 days. Mary says 40. I mean, so, you know, there's not going to be any way in any case that anything would be ready for the next – Amr, as Amr is noting in the chat room for the next – to the next Council meeting. And Amr's question suggesting one public comment period for both issues, I would suggest one comment for both issues so that there is just one mark up of the Operating Procedures and then one version that's created with all of the changes.

You know, and that version goes up to the Council with all the changes for consideration. That would be more expedient so even if it takes a little bit more time for us to draft the language for chair/vice chair elections we would save time by having one public comment period instead of two.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie. Yeah, indeed – Mary was mentioning the 40 days. That means that it would end up in the Helsinki meeting where it could be discussed on the Council. And that's perhaps not a bad idea to have some discussions face to face in Helsinki especially on the chair and vice chair election process. But it's probably taking a bit more volume.

So can we agree that we extend the full consensus call until Monday 25th so that we can close it on Monday – I presume it's 2359, the period when we consider that it closes. And then we have enough time in front of us to work

on the second issue and wait for public comments until we have the second issue taken care of, which is the chair/vice chair elections.

And I don't see any objection so...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Hello, it's Wolf-Ulrich.

Rudi Vansnick: Hi Wolf-Ulrich.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Just trying to call and I heard your last word so I agree, thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay fine. I'm happy that you just joined the call (unintelligible) the agenda being the DNSs of subteam B on the text and discussions about the chair and vice chair elections. You probably have been in that discussion too. I don't see Anne Aikman-Scalese actually – she was chairing that team. But I presume that I can count on anyone else that is in that group to (unintelligible) status on where we are in that discussion.

So, Wolf-Ulrich, are you able to...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh, sorry, sorry. I didn't catch what – I'm just on the car here on the phone so well I'm not on Adobe Connected. But you wanted to – what was the question, I'm sorry. I didn't catch that.

Rudi Vansnick: Well, yeah, if you're in a car it's probably not the best way to handle this. I don't know who else was on this subteam and has been in – I think there was

a call before this SCI call of the subteam B discussing the changes and text of the issue. Anybody who was on that call could comment?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is Anne Aikman-Scalese not available?

Rudi Vansnick: No, she is not yet on the call. And I know that last time – last call there was an issue of the time zone. She thought it was an hour later. And I know that Michelle has been triggering her to see if she is online and can join the call. But otherwise I have in front of me, if I'm correct, the text of the previous version.

I could eventually go through the text that is presented in the Adobe Connect. Thanks, Julie, and Mary for bringing that up. If we go to...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, do you want to talk?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Rudi, if I may just briefly. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So just to update, I remember, you know, you couldn't (unintelligible) as well. So at first we decided, well, to list the item to the SCI and not anymore have meetings with the SCI B – the subgroup meeting. So we will handle all the remaining issues on the SCI level. That was the first thing.

And then the status is from that is described in all the action items in the text which Julie distributed to the list, and where I have commented today to some of these items. So if you could go through those items I think there were three or four scenarios we had in mind with regards to what could happen in case of the chair election.

And so I put also my comment in, if somebody could take or you could just walk through that. There were some action items which were asked by Julie, some specific items, questions to be answered to the several scenarios. And

I did it in writing and I do hope some others may have comments to that. So far from my (unintelligible) thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for the information and the guidance. Well, yes, I will walk through the text that is in front of us. And the first action item that needed confirmation is affirm that the deadline of 14 calendar days is the preferred option to scenarios 2, 3 and 4. And I can read there that it has been affirmed so it's – the deadline of 14 days is preferred option. We have the...

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: Sorry?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah, it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. If I may? So affirmed that was by myself, you know, that's my comment so in blue. You know, the question is what is with regard to the other participating stakeholder groups and constituencies. So affirmation was done in our constituencies so that point. I don't know what other comments are to this. But it seemed to me from the hands discussion we had that that is more or less in the hands of the participants, well, to accept the 14-day period. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So indeed what is in blue are the reactions that you have been given. And I didn't see any others so far, I didn't see on the mail any others commenting on it. I don't know if there is anyone willing to comment on the first action item, affirm that the deadline of 14 days – calendar days is preferred option for the three scenarios, 2, 3 and 4. I don't see any objections. We could take that as confirmed by the group. So thank you, Amr, for putting the green flag.

Then the second action item is review the proposed new language for scenario 3, replace the text which may include (diverting) NCAs with from within its respective house. So the text change is "which may include



(diverting) NomComm appointees” with the text “from within its respective house.”

I see that the reaction from Wolf-Ulrich is okay. I would like to suggest a similar edit to scenario 2 – option 2. “The house with vacant vice chair position shall designate an interim vice chair from within this house to join.” That’s the proposal that Wolf-Ulrich made here.

And another suggestion for scenario 4 is, “if both houses should fail to temporarily fill the role of vice chair on an interim basis the nonvoting NCA, unless being a chair candidate, will be designated.” Sorry.

Other comments that Wolf-Ulrich has brought to this action item 2. Is there anybody having any remarks, changes, suggestions on what is proposed? Yes, Amr, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. Yeah, I just wanted to voice my agreement with all of Wolf-Ulrich’s suggestions here. In terms of the second scenario I think it’s a good thing to always have consistent language especially when it clears up any ambiguities.

On scenario 3 I also very much agree and thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for actually sending this around because I think I misunderstood what the IPC was recommending here until you commented on it. But, yeah, I agree with Wolf-Ulrich completely and I don’t see any reason why at this point in scenario 3 where there are continuing vice chairs that a house should have to go through a process to replace him or her. I thought the whole point of this was to try to streamline things and make the process less messy and less difficult because this has already resulted because of a failure to elect a Council chair.

So I think the quickest easiest solution here would be to continue with the sitting or the vice chair who is ending his or her term and keeping that person

on as an interim vice chair. And throughout scenario 3 and hopefully not require moving ahead to scenario 4. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. And I'm noting in the chat quite an interesting question from (unintelligible), question regard the election process that's out of the box from what we've been discussing. Is there a reason why we couldn't do away with houses and have simple majority of all votes for any councilor put forward for chair? She seems to be curious out that text that – I think it's not that easy is just replaced by having a simple majority of all votes.

Do we need to – simple majority vote or is it – was it 2/3 majority for the elections of the chair? I'm just wondering, I didn't check the text about that one. Oh yeah, I see Mary Wong is responding that would require changes to the current procedures. Yeah, and the current procedures state that the GNSO chair shall be elected by a 60% vote of each house which is quite high already. So a simple majority wouldn't work. Not in the scope of the current (unintelligible) Council.

So going back to our action items, I didn't hear any objections to the changes that were proposed by Wolf-Ulrich and the IPC on action item 2. I think we can consider that that text is okay for the next version of the document. I'm trying to follow the discussions also in the chat. (Unintelligible) that each house will be allowed to nominate one candidate for GNSO Council chair. Each house is responsible for determining how to nominate its candidate. Candidate for GNSO Council chair does not need to be a member of a house but must be a member of the GNSO Council.

Should the chair be elected from outside of the houses that chair will be nonvoting chair. Which is similar to the NCA candidate that is also a nonvoting member. I just have one question about the text if the chair becomes a nonvoting member is there still balance in the number of votes? It's perhaps a stupid question, that is just something that (unintelligible) we

are going through the text here. Do we still have balance for voting in the Council if the chair is a nonvoting member?

((Crosstalk))

Rudi Vansnick: ...for that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Rudi, if I may. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, well this doesn't alter any proportion of the voting scheme in the Council because, you know, the nonvoting NCA is still – remains as nonvoting if he was elected as a nonvoting one. Maybe he's appointed the Council chair or not, it doesn't matter. So for Council voting it doesn't really matter.

Rudi Vansnick: Yeah, okay. Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. Rudi for the transcript by the way. So when we look into action item list now we have action item 3, consider the issue raised by IPC that even where a vice chair is continuing in his or her term relevant house should have the ability to appoint a different interim vice chair that is otherwise eligible.

And the response to that one is, at the moment it's – I can't see a reason to replace as vice chair just for the purpose of conducting the election. If a house has no confidence in the vice chair it already put in place then this issue had to be solved before. In addition valuable time would be saved by keeping the incoming vice chairs.

Seems to me in this normal process forward in order to not block any process. But I would like to hear from others what they think about – so the question if a house has no confidence in the vice chair it already put in place

does the issue have to be solved before? That means that it has to be solved before the election process started at that level.

Yes, well, Amr, is asking if IPC could comment on this as it is their suggestion. I don't know, Wolf-Ulrich, can you eventually hear from views on this. If you remember, they have been discussing this (unintelligible). Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, I don't know if you're still online. Maybe we lost him.

Yes, Amr, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Rudi. This is Amr. Yeah, like I said before I completely agree with Wolf-Ulrich on this and perhaps for more reasons than the ones he put in blue. But, yeah, we should try to be making this whole process easier. But in principle I think before we wrap this point up we do need to hear from Anne Aikman-Scalese or Lori on this – with their suggestion and I don't think we should sort of wrap this up until we hear from them and perhaps they hear some of the feedback that we've given.

I haven't seen them comment on Wolf-Ulrich's email either so, yeah, I guess we should probably table this until we can hear from any one of them on this. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. Rudi for the transcript. Yeah, I see that Anne Aikman-Scalese is tied up in another call. And in fact they're all quite important in helping us going through this discussion as they are key in what they have been bringing forward. I don't know if – and Lori cannot – I think that Lori is on travel, I think she is in France somewhere. And I know from Klaus that they had some difficulties to connect the calls yesterday.

With that said, I'm just wondering can we go through – let me see, we have the three action items. We need to have clarification from IPC. Maybe we can go through the scenarios and see if we need to have some changes inside the text that is proposed. I think you all have had a chance to go through the

six changes that was done. And they were done at the last call if I'm not wrong.

Looking through scenario 1 there is no – I don't see any redline text or I presume that that text is stable enough and doesn't need any further discussion. In scenario 2 we have in fact two options in it. Option 1 is the remaining vice chair shall oversee the chair election and conduct Council business until such time as a new chair is elected.

Or the second option, the house with a vacant vice chair position shall designate an interim vice chair to join the continuing vice chair to oversee the chair election and conduct Council business. The deadline for the vacant house to designate its interim vice chair is 10 calendar days or in (this) Council meeting at which no chair was conclusively elected.

And there is an other/or – or 14 days following the Council meeting at which no chair was conclusively elected or one week prior to the next scheduled GNSO Council meeting. So there are three options in timing. I see, Julie, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. I'll just note that to a certain extent we have addressed these in that Wolf-Ulrich had sent some comments that we started with, you know. The first was that it seemed that there was agreement for all of the scenarios – scenarios 2, 3 and 4 that is, that the deadline would be 14 calendar days. I mean, I know that Wolf-Ulrich affirmed that, I think seemed to be agreement on this call that 14 days is the preferred option. So we could then for 2, 3 and 4 assume that 14 days is the option.

With respect to scenario 2, Wolf-Ulrich had an option 2 in particular and suggested the language – the language that's there is the house with the vacant vice chair position shall designate an interim chair. The – if you scroll back up the new text in blue that Wolf-Ulrich had suggested was "from within this house" would proceed to join.

So I think – so after interim vice chair from with this house to join the continuing vice chair to oversee the chair election and conduct Council business. And then the deadline for the vacant house to designate its interim vice chair is 14 calendar days following the Council meeting at which no chair was conclusively elected. So I think it appears that we are settling on option 2. And then we have the consideration of the text that Wolf-Ulrich had suggested for that option 2.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie, for the help in going through the text here. So in fact for scenario 2 we could conclude that we have a text that stands for based on the proposal of Wolf-Ulrich. So there is “from within this house” is the wording that needs to be added to the option 2. And the selection of the “14 days following the Council meeting at which no chair was conclusively elected” is going to be the text we will review in scenario 2.

Looking at the scenario 3 we will have the same – the finishing for the deadline, 14 days. And I don’t see any further changes in the text so far that there is on – except we got (unintelligible) scenario 4. (Unintelligible) 4. It’s also there, the 14 days – calendar days following the Council meeting would be selected.

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

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi. This is Amr. There was something else that Wolf-Ulrich put in his email that I don’t recall if we addressed it or not I thought it was an interesting little detail. I would be interested - I'm not sure if Wolf-Ulrich is still on the call with us or not, but.

The thing is he suggested that in Scenario 4 that the non-voting NomCom appointee cannot be - cannot serve as an interim chair in the event that, you know, we get to the Scenario 4, if the NomCom appointee himself or herself

was actually a candidate for the chair in the failed election. That's the understanding that I got from what Wolf-Ulrich was suggesting here.

But then that leaves us with a scenario where there is no interim chair or interim vice chairs, and I'm just thinking this is a bit of pickle. We need to figure out where we're going to actually move ahead with this or suggest some alternative or possibly pull a Scenario 5 out of our hat somehow. I just wanted to bring attention to that. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. That was the case. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I see that Anne Aikman-Scalese was able to join us now. Julie, I see you still have your hand up. Is that an old hand or a new hand? Okay thank you.

So in Scenario 4, the - let me see (unintelligible), if both houses should fail to temporarily fill the role of vice chair on an interim basis, the non-voting NCA will be designated as interim chair to oversee the election and conduct council business until such time as a chair is elected. If I'm correct, there would be - that would not be possible if the non-voting would be a candidate him or herself. So we need to probably make a change if that's the case. Is that correct, Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Rudi, it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. It just was a general position though. I think we discussed that earlier that nobody who is on the list as being a candidate for the chair or an interim chair. So that was excluded in general, and that's what I wanted to point out here. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Rudi for the transcript. So we really need to have some changes in the text that it would make clearer that a candidate non-voting NCA cannot be the interim chair. I suspect now it's not really clear that it could not be. I see (Carl) is (unintelligible). What in calendar days is the usual timeframe for such activities? He's suggesting to include the timeframe

of 14 calendar days to allow for a generous period of time for the party to decide upon an interim chair.

Yes, Amr. What I'm just wondering is the text, the suggestion in Scenario 4, it is not mentioned in the text that the non-voting NCA as it would be eventually a candidate chair cannot take that position. To me the text is not really clear and satisfying as such. That's the reason why I'm just wondering if we need to change that text. Yes, Amr, you have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, Rudi. This is Amr. Yes my understanding is that if by the time we get to Scenario 4 that this is the option we're left with since the non-voting NCA to act as an interim chair to oversee the election, as well as conduct council business if needed. So that's the essence of Scenario 4. But then here we're up against some other very valid point that Wolf-Ulrich raised. If the NomCom appoints a non-voting NomCom appointee who was the candidate who fails to be elected or is planning on being a candidate with the second election round, then that may be problematic.

My instinct is just to make an exception for the non-voting NCA in this situation. That's just because I think it is extremely unlikely that the council will find itself at any point in dealing with Scenario 4. Hopefully we will not have failed elections in the future, and hopefully if we do we'll manage to get through a second round before having to utilize Scenario 4.

But if in the event, the extremely unlikely event, that we do have to deal with Scenario 4 and have a non-voting NCA be appointed as interim chair and that the same non-voting NCA was or is going to be a candidate for the chair election, I think we may want to consider making an exception to the rule that Wolf-Ulrich mentioned that we have agreed on. So we should just consider it at least for now. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Rudi, Wolf-Ulrich speaking.



Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes well I fully agree with Amr. So this is a really, you know, Scenario 4 it would be, well, most - hopefully most unlikely scenario. And before you know it happens that both houses would not be in a position now to designate a vice chair, at first this one which I added, you know, the house would mean that it could happen then before if somehow it was in a position now to designate a vice chair. And for this case, you know, it's also a question about would we then just carry on with one vice chair. (Unintelligible) of the other house.

In the other case, if, you know, Scenario 4 takes place in a formal arrangement, it means both houses cannot designate a vice chair, then I would also see no problem now with what Amr was saying now to make an exception here. Because that is so unlikely and that's a very last resort. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Yes indeed. It would bring us to Scenario 5 again if we want to cover everything. It would be pushed into a Scenario 5, which we currently need to avoid to get too far away from the original process itself. And indeed if it's - if the sensitivity in selecting an interim chair is so high, I think that we probably have a lot of other issues before ending up on - in that stage.

So the - I was just thinking about the - if in Scenario 3 we don't have that case open up if the interim vice chair will co-chair the chair election. Let's see. Conduct council basis (unintelligible) some other chair is not currently elected once the election is complete to serve in those things. And a candidate for chair will not be electable to serve as designated interim vice chair to avoid potential conflicts of interest.

There the text is quite clear. A candidate for chair would not be elected - eligible to serve as a designated interim vice chair to avoid potential conflicts

of interest. That covers the case. Otherwise is there anybody having any remarks with regards to the proposed scenario so far? Otherwise I think that based on the input, except for the action item three where need input from IPC, we'll have some clarification of the text that is proposed here.

And maybe, Anne Aikman-Scalese, I don't know if you are able to answer the question of what is proposed in action item three. At the moment I can't see a reason to replace this issue just for the purpose of conduction the election. If a house has no confidence in its vice chair (unintelligible), then the issue has to be solved before. In addition, various time could be saved by keeping the interim VC.

I don't know, Anne Aikman-Scalese, if you have any clarification or explanation for the action item three.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I am sorry, Rudi. I had to come on the call very late and when you say action item three, let me just get focused on again on exactly what that change was. Was it relation to appointing...

Rudi Vansnick: It was the issue where the IPC that even where a vice chair is currently in his or her term, the relevant house should have the ability to appoint a different interim vice chair that is otherwise eligible.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes that's - that sounds like a comment that I got from leadership saying that I think there's, you know, a lot of discussion under way in the Non-Contracted Parties House at this time about kind of a rotation system for vice chair appointees.

The logic behind is was the possibility that one of the houses that would be sort of next up for - or one of the constituencies that would be next up for having a vice chair appointed could go ahead and put that interim vice chair in if it was assumed that later that they might want to be appointing that interim vice chair permanently.

There's some discussion going on about rotation of vice chairs among the constituencies in the Non-Contracted Parties House, and that was the logic behind it.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you, Anne Aikman-Scalese. (Unintelligible) Amr would like to have some explanation on this issue. Amr, I see you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Rudi, and thanks, Anne Aikman-Scalese. This is Amr. Yes I appreciate the sort of the dynamics between rotating vice chairs, at least within the Non-Contracted Parties House. I'm not sure how the contracted party folks do it. But again these are extreme circumstances and we're trying to develop a process that streamlines. And here we're just talking about an interim vice chair who will serve for possibly a number of weeks.

So I was - I just thought it would be counterproductive to what we're trying to do to suggest that one or two of the houses will be required to go through some sort of selection process when we're trying to avoid those and we're moving down scenarios because repetitively these selection processes are failing, these processes are failing.

I will note that the council chair election that took place at the annual general meeting we did have a vice chair from the non-contracted parties who did continue as an interim vice chair and then was replaced. And indeed we had the same from the contracted parties. The vice chair contracted parties at that time continued as an interim vice chair and then also was replaced after the election was finalized.

It seems to have sort of worked itself out the last time we did it. I think it's the easiest and most streamlined solution. And I would suggest that we need complicate it as of this point. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Amr. And indeed I think is a less conflicting situation. It's just for an interim period. It's not that complicated and it's probably not getting into a bigger discussion. I see Anne Aikman-Scalese you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sure thanks. This is Anne Aikman-Scalese for the transcript. Yes, Amr, I can volunteer to take that question back to the IPC for reconsideration. I think it arose basically from discussions that were occurring in L.A. and then in the intersessional meeting of Non-Contracted Parties House. And I don't know, Amr, if you have had an opportunity to check with your own constituents with respect to this particular issue. I know you had said that they were not very interested.

But it was my understanding it arose in discussion as a result of some things that happened out in L.A. in the intersessional. But I will absolutely take it back to IPC and point out that it's been commented that it could be, you know, an unnecessary complication and I'll get back to you guys on that. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Anne Aikman-Scalese. Rudi for the transcript. With that we have clarification on this point, which brings us to the fact that the proposed text for issue two needs some clarification from IPC. Otherwise so far I would say that the text that is in front of us with the modification based on what was proposed by Wolf-Ulrich, essentially the 14 calendar days in all the scenarios, 2, 3, and 4, could be identified. And then I think the text as is front of us could for a last review so that the next call we could consider finalizing that text. And then if we can close that, we could go for a consensus call also for that one, which would help us getting the two together.

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

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. I'll just note we'll - staff will go ahead and send around the agreed upon text from this meeting

and also take note of the actions that Anne Aikman-Scalese and Amr will go back to their groups concerning the clarification question.

I will note that there is a further step that then would have to happen after this, that is that staff will have to draft the operational - the language for the operating procedures. It will be similar to this language but, you know, with the appropriate section changes and additions and so on. And that's what would then be considered in, you know, a consensus call as we did this last time.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Julie, for the clarification. And indeed, it will probably take a bit of time to get a draft in the final document. I'm just wondering if there is any other discussion that is needed on what is in front of us or on issue two. If there's none - yes, Amr, Julie is proposing that she will, together with staff, will work on finalizing the text and the action items list and further on draft the text that is needed for the final approval.

Yes I see it's mentioned in the chat. So if we don't have any other discussion on issue two, we can probably have a look into any other business that we need to take care of, which is probably when should we have our next call and the SCI meeting. As Amr and Anne Aikman-Scalese need to go back to their group, and we have no urgency for the next council meeting, what would be the preferred time for our next call? It's in two weeks. That's what Julie was typing. Is that okay for everybody if we schedule our next meeting in two weeks?

Maybe for Anne Aikman-Scalese is there a time conflict for you? Is it better if we could eventually change the time?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No, I think that's not - this morning I had a client call that - one of those touchy clients, you know? Let's see here. Let me take a quick look at what - let's see, we're talking about the 5th of May, is that correct? Yes. I look

clear at that time on the 5th of May. I don't know about others, but I look clear then. So I apologize for this morning. I - but they do pay my salary, so.

Rudi Vansnick: I know about that also, Anne Aikman-Scalese. It's sometimes very difficult. I had three calls today and I had to shuffle a meeting with a client. And I really had to say, "Sorry I can't. Can we do this tomorrow?" That's why we are volunteers.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. I'm normally able to work around but not in this particular call this morning. So I thank you for your indulgence. Sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: That's all right. You're welcome. So next call will be the 5th of May at 18:00 UTC. And we will have a chance to have probably some exchanges on the mailing list with some input from the other communities. I see Amr you have your hand up. Do you want to?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh no I'm sorry, I think that's just an old hand. Sorry.

Rudi Vansnick: No it was Amr who was raising his hand.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: I just wanted to - this is Amr. You know, I was just going to say that I may be traveling between the 3rd and the 6th of May. And so if I am, I mostly likely will not be able to join the next call scheduled on May 5. So apologies in advance if I can't make it.

Rudi Vansnick: No problem, Amr. But I suppose that you will have the actions from the NCSG group before that date.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, yes, hopefully I should. I should certainly have reactions from them on the question that Anne Aikman-Scalese and I were asked to take back to our constituencies, certainly. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay thank you very much. So with that, I think we can call this meeting to a close. Thank you all for your participation. Thanks for those being on a mobile connection like Wolf-Ulrich. And we'll see each other on the 5th of May at the same time.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Rudi. Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

END