

**ICANN Transcription
Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation WG
Thursday 02 June 2016 at 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee On Improvement Implementation WG call on Thursday 02 June 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-02jun16-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC – Primary – Vice Chair
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC – Primary – Chair
Sara Bockey – RrSG – Primary
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary
Angie Graves – BC – Primary
Renata Aquino-Ribeiro – NCUC - Alternate

Apologies:

Amr Elsadr – NCUC – Primary
Lawrence Olawale-Roberts – BC – Alternate
Lori Schulman – IPC - Alternate

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong
Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Gery
Michelle DeSmyter

Michelle Desmyter: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation Working Group Call on the 2nd of June at 1800 UTC.

On the call today we do have Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Sara Bockey, Rudi Vansnick, Angie Graves, Anne Aikman-Scalese. We do have apologies from Amr Elsadr, Lawrence Olawale Roberts & Lori Schulman. From ICANN staff we have Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Glen De Saint Gery and myself, Michelle Desmyter.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And I'd like to turn the call (over) to Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Michelle. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. And as usually, one of the first items on our agenda is looking into the SOIs and see if anybody has to mention any changes in the SOIs. No. Not seeing any or hearing any, we can move to the next agenda item, which is trying to finalize the discussions on the proposed thick.

And thanks to ICANN staff, Julie, Mary and others, for delivering this final document now that we will try to work through today in order to have a final decision possible in the coming weeks.

I think quite a lot of exchanges already on the mailing list. It's a lot of agreements. What I propose is that we go to the text that is actually in the Adobe Connect and work through the text that has changed. And that is highlighted in another color if they do agree (on them) - on this way forward.

And so it's essentially just 2.2, the officers' election chair and vice chair (the figure) that we need to finalize here. And in .b there has been a modification of the text that (Sans) ask and I'm thinking the second sentence in it, candidate for GNSO Council chair does not need to be a member of the house but must be a current or incoming member of the GNSO Council.

So it's essentially the text current or incoming member that has been added to the text. I see Julie you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Hi Rudi. Yes. This is Julie Hedlund. So I just wanted to point out something if it's helpful for how we're going through this document. I'll just notice that the red lines here are really - and like in this case in 2.2b the current or incoming.

So this is language that's been agreed to for quite some time. And really it's just showing the, you know, the - (what) it says in this case just a minor change to the, you know, the original text in the procedures.

I'm wondering if it might - and same too with F where it says to jointly oversee the new chair election and conduct Council business. This is something that we've - and then, you know, in the event that one or both vice chairs terms and someone - these are all really just reflections of, you know, some of our discussions that happened even as far back as Marrakech.

So what I might suggest is that, you know, we just focus on whether or not people have any substantive further changes to this text. You know, people have seen this particular text now for I think about a month.

And the only change from the last meeting was really just the change in brackets that staff had suggested in place of vacant house the house with the vacant vice chair position. That's bracketed.

And then there was, as you noted, quite a bit of agreement on this current text of (Sans) and the timeline as well that was modified by Wolf-Ulrich on the list.

So perhaps we - if it's okay with you, we might focus on whether or not people have any questions or changes to this text and just reminding

everyone that I think the intent was to put a final text out by today for a consensus call for our usual two week call.

And then that would give us time to have the text finalized and agreed upon before Helsinki. And then Amr - I think the idea was that Amr could just send a written update to the Council list letting them know that we'd reached consensus on the two various issues that have been brought the SCI's attention and that the next step will be to put these out jointly for public comment.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Julie. And I'm very happy with your proposal as it will shorten the discussions anyway. And as I said, indeed I've seen quite a lot of agreement on the proposed text on the mailing list.

So yes, let's move forward that way. I see Anne, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you Rudi. I'm also in agreement with what Julie has proposed and what you said. There is one thing I would like to clarify just because I want to be able to answer questions on the consensus call at the IPC level since I tend to get pretty detailed questions there from leadership.

And that is this question about if one half - this is Scenario Number 3 I think. It's the ones where both vice chair positions are being vacated and no chair is conclusively elected and each house must appoint within 14 calendar days.

And that question that seemed to be arising on the list about conducting Council business when only one house has appointed its vice chair vacant seat.

All I'm really trying to understand right now is what our language says about that. Do we wait for the appointment of both vice chairs where they're vacant or do we - if one house appoints faster than the other house, do we move

ahead with Council business with whichever vice chair has been appointed?
Because I will get that question. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Anne for this question. Rudi for the transcript. I think we discussed this several weeks ago and there was some agreement on moving forward with the Council business independently of the scenario that we have in front of us.

But I defer to ICANN staff in order to be sure that I'm not telling anything wrong. So Julie, I see you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Rudi, this is Julie Hedlund. You know, actually I see Wolf-Ulrich has his hand up so let me go ahead and defer to Wolf-Ulrich.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. That you. Yes Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Julie. I was hoping you for explaining that the understanding. I think it's within the very last sentence of Number 3 scenario. So (while) this case is brought up here so when one house is not able to designate an interim vice chair, then the other vice chair - interim vice chair should conduct the Council business as long as - for as long as no Council chair is elected.

So that is what we agreed. And for me that is very clear what it means. It means that in this case the one - or designated vice chair should conduct the business so that there is no break in the Council - in the continuation of the Council business.

At the last one - last time I remember so I think I made a suggestion or there was a discussion about that whether we should be flexible a little bit while to allow the other house, which was not able to come up with by the time here - by the deadline with an interim vice chair to come up later so in case if they may be ready two or three days later and they could designate somebody.

That should not be a problem well that this interim vice chair should also then join the other one to conduct business jointly. So that was - but understood that we had to set a very specific deadline here in order to provide clarity on what's going on here. So that's my understanding. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: (Thanks) Wolf-Ulrich.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'm sorry Rudi. It's Anne again, if I may. That wasn't my question. I'm sorry. I would need to clarify the question.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Go ahead.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. I'm very sorry. And I absolutely remember that whole discussion that Wolf-Ulrich is talking about. And it was completely agreed at the time with respect to the - after the passing of the 14-day period. And everyone said no, you know. If someone - if one house fails to appoint timely, you proceed with the vice chair from the house that did appoint.

My question was directed to what the language says about conducting Council business if - and I will give an example. Let's say in two days Non-Contracted Parties House appoints the vacant vice chair position but Contracted Parties House has not done so within - and we're talking about now this 14-day period.

Let's say there's one vice chair that's been appointed two days later and the other house still deciding. Then does Council business get conducted during that 14-day period or does Council business wait until both are timely appointed. So this is in a case where we're still within the 14 days.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Well, yes, that's indeed a time slot in which it's - there's some question marks about is the appointed vice chair allowed to do Council business before the end of the 14-day period. That's in fact your question is - I may shorten it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Yes, confirming that, yes.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Okay. So Wolf-Ulrich, what's your position in it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh, yes. Sorry. Sorry Anne. So that I did not get this point right. So now it's easier for me to understand. It's just about this 14 days. I understand. What is going with Council business within those 14 days?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And I - and I'm wondering whether, you know, independently of this case there is nothing in the procedures about that because, you know, in general because it may happen that a new Council chair has to be elected. And under the existing rules, there is also a second choice, you know, of nomination period.

And so I wonder Julie, do we know that? Does that - does the procedures say anything about that? Or did it say because, you know, it could have happened in the past as well independently of what was going on? Was it just about that the vice chairs are conducting the business or is there something else with that? So that's my question.

And I understand that you say if there are - there is a lack of one appointment by the 14th day of - after the election, what has happened? Also what is going to happen if both parties, anything - what is going to happen if both parties of those houses are just appointing after 14 days? What does it mean with regards to the continuing business? I didn't think about, so sorry. Good question. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Julie. And Mary, you have your hand up. You can respond to that?

Julie Hedlund: So thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you Rudi. Actually Mary and I are together at a meeting so we're just sort of conferring here. Our initial reaction to the question was that there wouldn't be any reason that if a chair, you know, as soon as a vice chair is designated that it - that vice chair couldn't conduct business within that 14-day period. There's nothing to prevent it.

I mean keeping in mind that we only put the 14 days in here so that there would be some impetus to get the houses to act within a certain period of time. And then when that period of time was over if there hadn't been any action, that then there would be a recourse to go to, you know, whichever chair had been, you know, designated to carry out the business.

So - and I do have the operating procedures up. And I don't initially see something that speaks either way other than that in the event - I mean this is as in the current procedures in 2.2. In the event that the GNSO Council has not elected a GNSO Council chair, you know, the vice chairs will serve as interim chairs. There's no timing on that.

I mean meaning that, you know, if you've got vice chairs, you don't have a chair, the vice chairs serve. That could be, you know, at any time. So our - I guess our initial reaction is that perhaps we don't need to put in any clarifying language.

I'm not even quite sure what it would be because it could get kind of complicated. I mean you'd really sort of have to say well, if at any time within those 14 days a house has designated an interim vice chair, that interim vice chair will carry out the business of the Council.

I'm not - we're not entirely sure that we need to say that. And to us it seemed like it was assumed that as soon as a chair - and interim vice chair, pardon me, was designated that that interim vice chair even under the current procedures would be willing to manage the Council business. Anything you want to add to that Mary?

Mary Wong: Hi. This is Mary. Hello everybody. Not really. I think Julie covered what we were discussing and thinking. So maybe what I would just add is that it will - first of all, talking about a fairly exceptional circumstance, one would hope where there is no conclusively elected chair.

And then secondly, and even more exceptional circumstance where in that event you have vice chairs that don't continue at the same time. So in that light and given what Julie was saying about the 14 days that the fact that this is motivation and impetus for both houses to get an interim chair designated as soon as possible.

In the meantime basically what we're saying is life goes on. And even though there may just be that one interim chair for 12 of the 14 days to use as example, I think it might be important to remember that the chair does not act in isolation even if that is the conclusive permanent chair.

That whether it's correspondence that comes in on meetings that have to be planned, that's almost always taken in consultation with the rest of the Council, with staff and so on.

So if there is a concern, and Anne, I don't know what the IPC concerns might be but if there is a concern that you've basically got one chair from one house running business for two weeks, I think from staff side we would say that there probably are checks and balances in the existing system already to make that quite unlikely. Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks a lot Julie. That's a lot Mary. Well as far as I (supposed) concluded that (the figures) there is no written language that says that you need two vice chairs to run the business, you need at least one person that is able to run the - to carry out the business - the daily business of the Council.

And in this case for a maximum period of 14 days there could be a vacant of not having a vice chair available and that's the only critical thing that I see. But I have two hands up. Anne, you have the floor.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you Rudi. It's Anne for the transcript. I do want to be very clear that there is no expressed IPC concern regarding this. It is just that in my experience I get asked questions - IPC's full of lawyers, right, so. And what the language says here in Paragraph 3 of 2.2.1, it says beginning one, two, three, four, five, six lines down the designated interim vice chairs will co-chair the chair election and conduct Council business.

And so I'm a little bit concerned that our language isn't flexible enough or that it could be read to require the business not be conducted until there are two vice chair appointed in that 14-day period, which I don't have that strong a feeling about because I mean I tend - I agree with Mary and Julie. It's an unusual situation.

But, you know, do we want to be in a situation where somebody says well, you know, you can't conduct any Council business until both - until the 14 days has run because this language says specifically that the vice chairs will co-chair and will co-conduct Council business.

I just, you know, I want to make sure that we're not, you know, for lack of clarity setting up a situation that could create an unnecessary tiff at the time. That's all. But I don't have a strong opinion about which way we go on it. I just think it tends to say that it's required that both of them be appointed before the Council business can be conducted. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Yes. Indeed I now that one - that the (one character) for lawyers means much more than sentences. And indeed the wording here that says the designated interim vice chairs with a S at the end mean that you need two vice chairs. And that could be - actually be

solved by having the S put between brackets. But just my idea. I'm seeing Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thank you Rudi. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I understand this also. And it's, you know, it could be - from the same point it could be, you know, that there is an urgent business to be done right after the failed election. So and that could mean to understand that then two weeks we are out of business because we are not able to conduct business because of missing vice chairs or so.

And I also would say this is theoretical because usually, you know, after the election or after this meeting, you know, that is why we have given 14 days because people need normally (unintelligible) one week, you know, to come back and to come to business as well. And then they need some time to interact within their constituency.

And so I also would say this is a very theoretical case. However, to your point in (first) for argument Anne, I think the very last sentence in Number 3 isn't that clear enough to say that the vice chair - the one vice chair could act alone? I think it says the vice chair will serve as an interim vice chair alone - yes, alone until the new - and this includes conducting business if necessary.

The main thing usually is after a failed election is well to immediately or to - as soon as possible to come back with the election of a new chair. So this is the major task to do so. And for that I think all the effort is focused on this task. And the other business normally stays behind that.

So I've - well I don't (see) and I'm happy (that I hear) from you that the IPC doesn't have not yet a formal concern with regard to that. And on the other hand, you know, if that would happen - if somebody stands up.

So why shouldn't the Council be in a position well to overrule that opinion in the case and say okay. It maybe - well, maybe it - but rationally we are going

for business. And you can appeal that, you know, after we have done it, you know. And you can claim that and coming up later on and we can adjust that.

I would say it this way because we are not, you know, like in a constitutional institution, you know, where it's really a sort of business, which is more than just this business. Thank you. That's my opinion.

Rudi Vansnick: That you Wolf-Ulrich. And Rudi for the transcript. And yes, it's quite theoretical. And I was just wondering that in the last sentence perhaps there is something we could add to avoid this let's say confusion that could exist by mentioning that the vice chair from the other house will serve as an interim vice chair alone until a new chair is conclusively elected, comma, also during the 14-day period. So that's the gap that Anne is mentioning.

But I'm again referring to the specialists. Julie, can you give some answer to that?

Julie Hedlund: Hi. This is Julie Hedlund and also Mary Wong. So we were chatting a little bit too. We're trying to think of a way that this could be addressed in the simplest way possible without adding additional language because we really do have quite a bit of language here. We had thought to cover sort of all eventualities.

One possible way to address this would be to take out in that final sentence the phrase within the allotted time period. The final sentence then would read should the house with the vacant chair position fail to designate an interim vice chair, comma, the designated interim vice chair from the other house will serve as an interim vice chair alone until a new chair is conclusively elected.

And that would mean then that if there was not a designation even within a couple of days of, you know, the, you know, within that time period, you know, sort of - and whenever, whenever. Then you would be able to have a vice chair who could operate alone.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. That indeed looks to me a quite good proposal. Anne, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you. It's Anne for the transcript. And I do think that especially for economy of language that that proposal would work. But I think that it would require a change in four to insert the language that's being taken out of three because four is our - we default to Item 4 if neither house appoints within the 14 calendar days.

And so I think that the within the allotted time period would have to go into Paragraph 4. Because otherwise you can say that well, one house appointed and that fulfills on an interim basis and you never go to four.

Rudi Vansnick: Good question Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Julie, you have any responses to that?

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. Well I'm not entirely clear what would need to go into four. I understand that your - you move to four if someone's not, you know, if you do not have a vice chair within the, you know, if you don't have a vice chair, then the other one serves.

But then you still have the issue in four that if both houses should fail to temporarily fill the role and so (it will) temporarily fill - you know, so in that respect four only kicks in if both houses fail.

In the instance that we were talking about I thought just now was that one of the houses did actually fill the role. And so four should never be invoked. But perhaps we're misunderstanding.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. Rudi for the transcript. What I understand from Anne's question that in case we are not having Scenario 3, which means none of the houses were able to appoint a vice chair.

Then in four as far I understood, Anne would love to see a text that clarifies that the work that would be carried out by the non-voting (NCA) member that will act as the interim chair will be within a certain time space. But I could be wrong. Anne, can you eventually clarify that?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you Rudi. It's Anne. I think actually everyone had already previously agreed that four comes into play if neither house designates an interim vice chair within 14 days. I don't think that four was ever intended as, you know - well, it's a question what the word temporarily means.

And I think that we were all agreed one point that the meaning of our revisions - our proposed revisions was that if neither house appointed within 14 days then we default to Item 4 and that this would be a very unusual situation.

But the language currently says, you know, on an interim basis. But I think that when we are talking about eliminating the allotted time period from the last sentence of three that the 14 days has to somehow come back into four or else four is, you know, there's no time trigger for four. There's no, you know, no one can tell when this four happened unless you specify that it's, you know, within the 14 days.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Anne. Rudi for the transcript. Yes. Indeed there is no time and definition except that it mentions that until such time as the chair is conclusively elected. It's just not covering the period of 14 days for the vice chairs. It's also about the election process to select and elect the chair as far as I understand. So but Anne - and Mary, I see you have you hand up. You have the floor.

Mary Wong: Thanks Rudi. Thanks Anne. And as Julie said, maybe we're - maybe she and I are missing something in this conversation. So it seems that we have a - we

could have a situation where we need to have interim vice chair. And there is a 14-day period.

So the first thing that then happens is we got Day 1 to Day 14. And at that point that - this is Anne's previous example there may only be one vice chair designated interim because the other house is a little more slow than the first house.

Then the answer to that as we discussed was that that interim sole chair would be able to conduct Council business to Day 14. On Day 14 hopefully there will then be two interim vice chairs because the second house would have selected a vice chair by then.

The scenario in four would only come in play if on or after the 14th (unintelligible), neither house had an interim vice chair. So Anne, I think we see what you're suggesting but we think that that's kind of implicit in the way that the language works from Sections two through to three through to four because two and three clearly sets out that there is a 14-day period for both houses. And four only kicks in after that.

I hope I'm not complicating things further but we're trying to understand if this is the scenario we're looking at. And if so, then we think that the language as is, is pretty clear that we are talking about Scenario 4 that happens after the 14 days where there's not a single or joint vice chair.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Mary. Rudi for the transcript. Now I'm a little bit confused. I thought that four comes in in the - when Case 3 fails anyway in its first action. We have none of the houses having designated the vice chair. So that's Scenario 4. And there is no discussion about the 14 days. If both houses are not appointing a vice chair, we - do we still have to wait till the 14 days to get the two - one or two vice chairs appointed? Is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. Our understanding is that's correct. Four does not come into play until after the 14 days. And only then if both houses have failed to temporarily fill the role of the vice chair.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Thank you very much. Rudi for the transcript. Anne, does that help you forward?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Well, I don't agree that it's as clear as, you know, we on the committee might seem to think it is. I think that, you know, based on our transcripts and everything with respect to Item 4, yes, we would all answer the question in the way that Mary has answered it.

But I firmly believe that in the interest of clarity and to eliminate, you know, Wolf-Ulrich described a - you know, there are situations sometimes that arise on Council just, you know, I object or whatever that all we would need to do is after - in 4 after the language on an interim basis we just put paren i.e. during the 14 days.

And then there's no question and no fights and what does this mean and it's a very, very short phrase. I see that Sara is agreeing with me in the chat that it's better to be explicit. And I hope that we can accept to do this because we all agree substantively what this means. Thank you. I think we do. I think we do. And Angie's also agreeing.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you Anne. Rudi for the transcript. I see Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thanks Rudi. Not to over complicate things, you know. But I was first thinking about, you know, what these guys have to do. You know, what is it about? You know, we have mainly the point now to perform the election, to prepare and to perform the election of the Council chair, well.

And if I would say there is some ongoing business where decisions have to be taken and this business should also be done, so. And so it could, you know, just practically thinking - it could happen the following thing.

Immediately after the failed election, it could happen that both houses come up in this case Number 4 where we have no vice chairs are continuing on business on Council. It could happen that both houses come immediately after the failed election come up in the session still okay. We have two people here, you know, we designate some - these are the ones. No problem. Do that. They could start immediately.

All these things could start as usual. So - and the other - it is, you know, it takes 14 days. Something to happen in between. Either one or both houses can do it in that way (unintelligible).

So what is really different here? It may happen that it, you know, just shifts the starting of the business of preparing the election. It's for 14 days, you know. And then it's - then it shall (stop).

But after the 14 days it really shall start either with one or two vice chairs or with the NonCom (FMT). And so this should be clear. And if that is not clear and understood to - from Anne's version that it seems to be not that clear, then we should adjust it. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Rudi for the transcript. And I'm just looking through what Mary was putting into the chat as a proposal for getting this text finally solved is that as we (leave) in the last sentence of the Scenario 3 with the allotted time period with something we needed to remove that we could set text in Scenario 4 in order to cover that question.

So that will be the proposal that in the sentence of Scenario 4 we would add if both houses should fail to temporarily fill the role of vice chair on interim basis and there we would add within the allotted time period is words - the non-

voting NonCom appointee will be designated the interim chair to oversee the chair election and conduct Council business until such time as a chair has completed the election. That would be the text. Can we agree on that format?

I see Anne is agreeing. I see Wolf-Ulrich also and Sara also. I think we have some consensus here that that would be the text we could put into the final version now. And I think with that we can end the discussion on this part of the text.

The only part that is left is the timetable. And I think that's quite clear what's in the timetable there. It's a practical way of moving forward on this process. And can we - oh, I see Julie, you have your hand up. Yes, you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry Rudi. This is Julie Hedlund. So just to be clear. So staff had thought that to move forward we would essentially accept all the changes that have been agreed upon except for highlighting in red line these new changes discussed today but go ahead and send that both the red lined and - and keep in mind that there will still be red lined that will show what has been proposed to be added or changed from the existing procedures.

And we do need to show that. And we can also show a clean version. But what we do want to highlight for people is that the - these changes that have been discussed here, which is to add the language after on an interim basis and the within allotted time period and then take that out of two and three.

But that we assumed we would proceed then with this language to a consensus call starting today and ending then in the usual two weeks. And then that would allow us to conclude this before Helsinki and would allow Amr to do a, you know, a - send an update to the Council list.

We have actually confirmed that because of the Council's very, very tight schedule in Helsinki, they will not have time for discussing an update on their

schedule in their agenda but the update could still be sent to the Council list. It could be discussed on the Council list.

And in the meantime the changes could go out for public comment. So that would not be held up. And in any case, the (unintelligible) would need to make a report and send a motion to the Council after the public comment period. So then we, you know, everything could proceed.

And just one other point we wanted to make is as I think we mentioned a few weeks back, because of the Meeting B format being much abbreviated from our usual meeting schedule, there is not the usual weekend for sessions, you know, for meetings.

And actually the only groups - working groups that are meeting are the PDP working groups. So there is no time slot for an SCI meeting. I hope that people had assumed that. But we thought it was worth just reminding people again that there will not be an SCI meeting in Helsinki. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Julie. Rudi for the transcript. Thanks for proposing these final way forward. And I indeed was also thinking about that we could start putting this on the SCI mailing list for a full consensus call. Otherwise we will not get ready in time for Helsinki.

So as far as I see in the timetable, which is the last page, I don't see any question about the timetable here. I hope everybody feels good with what is proposed in the timetable here. That - if that's okay, then we can in fact consider that - we start the full consensus call from today on.

And it would be good that we just mention to Amr what the changes have been. It will help him to quickly see what we did and what we discussed today. And for indeed in Helsinki it's - yeah, the first three (levels) of Helsinki tells us that it's a hell of a meeting schedule. Still figuring out what can still be integrated in the schedule itself.

So based on this proposal, I would say that we can ask ICANN staff to send out the final text now and the request of a consensus call that ends in two weeks from today. That would be the 14th or the 15th of June, which allows us to have things ready for Helsinki and that would allow us - Amr to bring it to the Council in the proper time period. That would be also something like ten days before they have the Council meeting.

Is this something we can agree upon? This committee. I see Anne is agreeing. And I think we don't have any objections with this proposal. With that - oh, I see Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up, yes Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks Rudi. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well just for clarity - when can we expect the document coming out for consensus call? Julie, do we have an idea about that?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. Yes. We did plan to send it out today. So - and then conclude the consensus call two weeks from today on the 16.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Thank you very much Julie. Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. And so we have a plan. We have an action plan. And which brings us to the last item of our meeting today, which is any other business. I don't know if there is any other business that we need to take care of.

I would say thanks a lot to all of you for this very productive series of meetings. It's going to be my first half-year Chair of the SCI. And I'm so

happy that in fact we are bringing solutions to both issues that we had on the table.

And that's thanks to all of you and thanks to the support of ICANN staff that we reached a process that probably would help us to say okay, after the summertime vacation we have our hands free for at least (unintelligible), which I hope is not going to come too soon.

So is there anything else we need to take care of? Is there anybody having any issues that we need to discuss today? Yes Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I - what I'm wondering Wolf-Ulrich is whether SCI itself will meet in Helsinki face-to-face or I know we are not presenting a report to GNSO Council. I didn't know whether we as a committee will meet together.

Rudi Vansnick: Well Anne, Rudi for the transcript. To answer you very quickly and I think Julie will respond also. There is no meeting scheduled for SCI as there is really no space and time available inside the meeting plan as it is today in the four-day meeting.

But again, I'm referring to Julie if she wants to add something to that. She is agreeing. So it's really very, very difficult to get even a half hour meeting in the time schedule of Helsinki. But as we are going to be there, we could meet and have a drink together as a conclusion of the work we have been doing. And that's a proposal I'm doing for all of us who are coming.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Well, that sounds good. Thank you Rudi. I guess I'll look forward to see if that happens.

Rudi Vansnick: And I will try to take care of that. I see you're not (unintelligible) asking for a plan for (unintelligible). Well, I think that there's still something that needs to be taken care of by the meeting team and again, they are going to help by having the last meeting of - I think the last three or four meetings of - we had

are all changed in location and that's really hard time to get - doing this stuff.
And I'm feeling really (unintelligible).

So I think we can conclude this call - this meeting. Thanks again for joining
the call and helping us getting this final stuff done. And we will have a call in
two weeks from now, which would mean that we would have the full
consensus call finished.

I don't see any other thing that I need to talk about. So thanks all. I see you
all in two weeks from now.

Woman: Thanks Rudi. Bye-bye.

Man: Rudi, thanks. Thanks.

Woman: Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Michelle Desmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop
the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Everyone enjoy the
remainder of your day. Thank you.

END