

**ICANN Transcription  
Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation WG  
Thursday 16 June 2016 at 1800 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Standing Committee On Improvements Implementation WG call on the Thursday 16 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-16jun16-en.mp3>

**Attendees:**

Lori Schulman – IPC - Alternate  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCP – Primary  
Angie Graves – BC – Primary  
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC –Primary –Chair  
Sara Bockey – RrSG – Primary  
Renata Aquino Ribeiro – NCUC – Alternate  
Karel Douglas – NCSG - Alternate

**Apologies:**

Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC – Primary – Vice Chair  
Amr Elsadr – NCUC – Primary

**ICANN Staff:**

Mary Wong  
Julie Hedlund  
Michelle DeSmyter

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation Working Group Call on the 16th of June at 1800 UTC.

On the call today we have Rudi Vansnick, Sara Bockey, Lori Schulman, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Angie Graves. We do have apologies from Amr Elsadr and Anne Aikman-Scalese. From staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. With that, I'll turn the call over to Rudi Vansnick.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Michelle. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. Welcome on this call that will probably not take too long as we have some good remarks and it looks like everybody is quite happy with the proposed document.

So then for second point on the agenda is still the SOIs and I suppose that nobody has any changes to SOIs till now. If there is any change, please tell us and you can do it eventually in the chat if you think there's something you need to mention.

And I would like to move on to third point on the agenda, which is the status of the (who) consensus call on chair and vice chair proposed revised GNSO operating procedures.

And we have on the screen now the red line text. And we received the mail from Anne giving all a yes for IPC. Although there was a little question about - and it looks like it was - if you all could read the Number 3 there in 2.2.1.

I've been looking through the text and I didn't see any reference to a chair with the question about should each house designate a Councilor for a chair. And I didn't see that text at all. So I saw that Julie also went through the text and didn't see any issue with Number 3 or Number 4 with regards to the text I was that was mentioned in the mail.

I don't know if anybody else has seen this as a new issue. We received that mail a few hours ago. I think that that's cleared up now. I can move forward with the text that is presented to us.

Is there anybody having any comments on this text that is proposed and can we have an agreement from each of the participants that we can approve the text that is presented by - that was done by Julie and Mary? And that is in front of us. Can I ask if there is anybody against the proposed text that your life your hand so that we will see if there is any opposition?

I suppose this is the right way to go to move forward so that we can close this full consensus call today in the normal way and proceed with the next steps of the process. I think Julie you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rudi. I'll just note that the - this is Julie Hedlund for the transcript. The consensus call does run through the end of the day today. But and then generally if there are no objections, then it is assumed that there is consensus. We do not require people to affirmatively confirm that they agree with the language although it was nice that IPC did so.

I don't know if the folks in the room want to just do a little, you know, agree or something like that. But that's also not necessary as well. If we hear no objections by the end of the day today, then we assume that the consensus call is ended and that text is (confirmed).

I'll just note that one other thing to discuss here today with respect to these procedures is that we were going to do an update email message from Amr to the Council letting them know that we had reached a consensus on both the motions and amendments and also on this item.

But I think that there was - we just wanted them in particular to look at the procedures, you know, one, two, three and four. I'll actually look back in my

notes because I think there was something in particularly that we wanted to raise to their attention.

And unfortunately Amr is not on the call and I know it's something he and both Anne had wanted to raise but wanting to get the Council's sense of, you know, let them know that these are the, you know, draft revised procedures for the chair, vice chair elections and see if they had any concerns or comments before we went to the public comment on this and the other procedures.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. Rudi for the transcript. And I just note in the chat that (unintelligible) has mentioned that Amr has passed this on the (ENC) and CSG and there were no objections raised.

Thanks for clarifying also the process that's in fact under Number 4 that (what was I) - what I was considering the next steps of the process is that we need to proceed with a (communication) to the Council that we would go through Amr.

I have to note that I know from earlier mail that - and messages that Amr will not be in Helsinki and will be replaced by Avri Doria. So I don't know if that means that he is not going to be able to talk into the Council meeting. If that's the case, we need to know quite rapidly. Yes Julie, you have your hand raised. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Hi. Yes. Actually - this is Julie Hedlund. It was not envisioned that this would be an in person update to the Council. I don't think there really is time for that in this particular meeting because there - they do have a lot of work to do in a much compressed amount of time.

I believe the intention was that the update would just go via email to the Council from Amr and that it would be considered on the GNSO Council email list. If they did find time for it for discussion in Helsinki that's fine. But I

think we said earlier that, you know, we couldn't guarantee that it would get on the Council's agenda. So no in person update is necessary.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Julie. Rudi for the transcript. I just wanted to inform everybody in the call here that Amr will not be present in the meeting in Helsinki. And in case there were some questions that people would like to ask in Helsinki about - he will not be there so (that would) be difficult. I see Wolf-Ulrich you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Rudi. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Just a question to be clear Julie about the process. So the - we are going right now (unintelligible) for sending out this text for public comment. So how - is that - is it done by approvals through the Council - from the Council? Or are we as team going to just to pop this out.

So because I'm asking that because of the - if the other - if the Council has to approve that, then there might be discussion before that on Council. I'm not (sure). Please clarify. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Julie, you have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. So I'm sorry. Mary and I were also discussing. You were asking whether or not the Council needs to approve the language before it goes out to public comment. Is that correct?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: My question was whether the Council has to approve that it goes to public comment or not.

Julie Hedlund: Right. No. The Council does not. That is something that the SCI can do.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Good.

Julie Hedlund: It was just in this instance I think just because the chair, vice chair procedures have gotten, you know, fairly complicated that we just kind of wanted to let them know where they stood. But there is no approval process.

I mean it's really a courtesy I think - not even a courtesy. I think this group just wanted to get a sense, you know, from the Council of they had any concerns about this before it was sent out for public comment but no need for them to actually approve it.

But I will note one of - what Mary and I were just discussing is that Mary -- good for her -- has found a typo. It is not - the typo is what was being raised by IPC but it is a typo.

So we thought we would let you know what it was and where it occurred and we could indeed just, you know, alert - if you prefer we can - let's describe it to you and you can decide how we should address it. It's not major but it is different.

Let's see. It - the language says the house with a vacant vice chair position instead of - it's - I'm sorry. It says a house with a vacant vice chair position, not the house with a vacant vice chair position. And since I have not actually seen where this occurred, let me just - it must be in - yes. I'm going to defer to Mary because she found it while I was talking. I have not actually found it yet. So please go ahead Mary. Sorry.

Mary Wong: Thanks Julie and hi everybody. So as Julie said, we don't believe this is a substantive change at all. It may not be technically a typo in as much as just a question of proper English usage.

It does go to the point that I think - it may have been Amr who raised it first that in this Paragraph 3, which is on the screen, we are talking about a scenario where there's no chair and there's no vice chairs.

And then what happens, you know, if one house gets an interim chair and the other one doesn't. So the point here is if you look at the last sentence in this Paragraph 3, we do say at the moment should the house with the vacant vice chair position fail to designate its interim vice chair.

The reason we say that is that that repeats the language from Paragraph 2 above and it does actually refer to a similar scenario. But like I said, in terms of English usage, Paragraph 3 is usually the case where you don't have any vice chairs.

So it makes no sense to say that is the house with the vacant vice chair position. In other words, for this sentence instead of saying should the house with the vacant vice chair position fail to designate an interim vice chair.

That part of the sentence should simply read should a house fail to designate an interim vice chair, the designated interim vice chair from the other house will serve as an interim vice chair alone. I hope that's clear and that you agree with us that that's actually not a substantive change. And I see that Lori has signaled her agreement in the chat.

If folks agree with this change for consistency of English, it doesn't touch on the substance, it doesn't change anything about the process, then our suggestion is that we can agree to make the change on the call; take it to the list and maybe allow for a number of days; say, you know, three business day or whatever for anyone to object or to question it.

And certainly there might be people who might need a further explanation or a full explanation but we could allow for that opportunity without having to redo the consensus call all over again. So thank you Rudi and (Menata) I see your agree as well. And Angie in the Adobe as well. So on that note, Rudi, I will just turn it back to you to summarize what you think we should do.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Mary. And as a long native speaker - English speaker, I wouldn't have noticed even that it makes a difference. And indeed as you explained, it makes a little difference except that if you read through Point 3, it doesn't make a change in the way we would like the procedures to proceed.

So personally I have no objection and just wondering Wolf-Ulrich and you are in fact the only one that - and I think Sara too that didn't agree on this change because then if we have an objection, you need to go through the (unintelligible) for several days as was mentioned by Mary.

(Unintelligible) like we all are happy with that little change. It's a three-character change by one character. Doesn't make that big difference. So I would like to move forward with what is proposed. We could (eventually) as Lori is mentioning - we could maybe - there are people absent on the call, just make a note to the list that we are changing the wording here so that everybody (unintelligible).

And as far as I can see it's close of business day, which is in several hours from now. So if this is possible that we go through (that) any difficulties and have the true consensus end it today. I think Julie you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. And actually I think - so Amr had suggested a change to the text that I thought we had picked up. And I'm actually chagrined now that it doesn't appear here and I could have sworn it was in brackets.

Amr had suggested should one of - for Number 3 because it was a difference from Number 2. And should one of the houses fail to designate an interim vice chair the designated interim vice chair from the other house will serve as an interim vice chair alone until the new chair is conclusively elected.

Also noting that - so this is actually (a mime) what he suggested. It's just slightly different. Not to complicate things but, you know, should a house -



should one of the houses - should a house fail to designate - should one of the houses fail to designate. I mean I think it's essentially the same language as Amr was suggesting.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. And I'm just looking through my notes that I made on the last call. And indeed it is something but I (can't see my) - I've been quickly noting in on piece of paper here. And I will - it is the same paragraph that - the same sentence that he was pointing to.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And so - this is Julie again. I apologize. I thought that, you know, when - after we sent that around I had amended the language to reflect the change that Amr had suggested. It appears that didn't happen. But nonetheless that would argue for notifying people - I mean Amr did make that suggested change at least a week ago. There were no objections to it.

So what I'll do is - I think I'll just go ahead and call it out to people and, you know, and ask if there's any objections. And I guess where do we stand and how much time to give people to object or not.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you Julie. Rudi for the transcript. What I would like to propose is that (in the survey) that we give people time till Monday. It doesn't make that much change I think between now and Helsinki. There is nothing that will happen anymore.

So if we propose that we close the full consensus call on next Monday, then everybody had the chance to go to it and eventually note something if there is need for. Is that a process we can agree on, which meets the (return) anyway to make the two notations to the list and it impact in fact the way people could react to the full consensus call.

So if - I would propose that we move as such and we close the full consensus call on Monday, the 20th close of business, which will allow us to then proceed Tuesday and I'm entering into the next steps point of the agenda.

We would then or ICANN staff will then proceed with the next step, which is doing an update email to the Council of where we stand. And the other question that I then have is when do we decide to move forward for public comment.

Is there a timing that we need to expect or is this something we could do before or after Helsinki? That's one of the questions that I have. And I would like to know if Julie or Mary you can advise here if we do it before Helsinki or after Helsinki. Yes Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Hi Rudi. And I'm sorry. I was just distracted for a moment. You're asking about the update should it be before or after Helsinki?

Rudi Vansnick: No. About the public comment phase. I think that the update to the Council is something we are going to do on Tuesday or Wednesday next week so that it ends on the table for the Council before they have their meeting in Helsinki. But the other - and the next step is about the - we have the two issues on the table for public comment. Do we proceed with this publishing it for public comment before Helsinki or is this done after Helsinki?

Julie Hedlund: Hi Rudi. This is Julie for the transcript. It would be after Helsinki for a number of reasons. First I think because we wanted to see if there was any guidance forthcoming from the Council with respect to the update that Amr sends, you know, just notifying them of, you know, sending the language along particularly for the chair, vice chair.

But we can certainly send the other language as well, you know, alerting them to the fact that, you know, we - the procedures for the elections as, you know, is relatively complicated. We would like them to look at that. We're not asking for their approval for public comment but, you know, we could indicate our intention that these will be sent out for public comment, as is the usual procedure after Helsinki.

Generally also the other reason is we don't like to start a public comment period just prior to an ICANN meeting because, you know, people are traveling and they're not paying attention and then we end up having to extend the public comment period anyway since the first bit gets lost. So that's - that would be my suggestion.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Julie. And Mary, you want to add something to that?

Mary Wong: Yes if I may. Not so much to that particular point because Julie has summarized it exactly as the staff was thinking. But just a supplemental point that the public comment period even if we go after Helsinki should close in time for this timeline that we see now on the screen to happen because one of the - well the major change I think that we clarify in what we're suggesting is that incoming Councilors should be eligible to run for the chair position.

And I see a check from Wolf-Ulrich so I wonder if he was going to make the same point. And so if you look at this timetable, given that the AGM will be in early November this year if you could backwards, there will be time for the new Council members to be announced and for them and their houses to consider who should be the nominee if that could perhaps be one of them.

The - I think the only other thing that may be relevant here really has nothing to do with the SCI or the Council, which is that then the SGs and Cs would have to get the houses in order to get the voting done. And I think in respect of that, Glen will be discussing this with the Council and with the SG&C leadership in Helsinki. Thanks Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you very much Mary. Rudi for the transcript. Wolf-Ulrich, you want to add something to this?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes. Thanks Rudi and thanks Mary. That's really good points. And it's very important (I know) this timeline. And I was wondering therefore whether we really need to wait for comments from the Council at this point.

If we do so I think that then really we have - we should make this point in Helsinki and have a kind of conversation about that rather than waiting for something from the email list so if we are of the opinion. So I'm - I was just thinking well after we had these several rounds of let me say more or less consensus calls with some other (case of) amendments.

And so I'm asking myself whether it's necessary to wait for some Council input or whether we shouldn't start immediately after close of consensus call to put together the documents and then send it out for - immediately for public comment in order to save time. Because as Mary said, you see the first point on the timeline is usually at this meeting in Helsinki.

The proposed procedure should be announced. And how shall we do that if we are just not clear about that. And well we should save as much as possible. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Rudi for the transcript. Well I have something additional to it, not with regards with the timing of when the public comment should start and I agree with Julie (and in) that we should do it after Helsinki for several pragmatic reasons.

But I have also the question about when does - when is this procedure implement? Is it at the end of the - after we handled all the public comments we would receive and eventually review or is that earlier? So Julie, I see you have you hand up. Can you help us through this?

Julie Hedlund: Hi Rudi. This is Julie for the transcript. So first to Wolf-Ulrich's point. As Mary mentioned, we're reluctant to send this out before Helsinki because it actually will not save us time.

We can't really count - I mean could - we can't really count the week of the ICANN meeting. And while conceivably we could count next week, well we're not getting - we wouldn't really be able to get it out until Tuesday or Wednesday.

These things take actually quite a bit of time to prepare. And it's not all something that we can do on our own. It's something that happens with our tech people who manage the Web and what goes up on the Web. And there are a number of approvals in that process as well.

So we're really talking about perhaps just a few days next week. And then we have to assume that Helsinki does not - that we're not even counting that week. So we have to then add a week in the public comment process for Helsinki. So it would really maybe only buy us a few days. And as Mary pointed out, because of the timing of the AGM, we don't have any (restraints) there.

Now the, you know, we would - to Rudi's question, we would need to get this approved at a GNSO Council meeting. So the - even if we were to do the public comment now, the whole public comment process would - and then, you know, the collection of the comments if there are any and consideration of the comments by the SCI, I don't think we would be able to have this ready for the GNSO Council meeting on the 21st of August.

That there is no - there is no Council meeting on the 21st of July - pardon me. There is no Council meeting in August although there may - we can do a vote of course without, you know, without a meeting. But then it's envisioned that there have been some discussion, you know, prior to that.

So I - then that would put us into September. Let me just confer with Mary too as we're looking at the timing here. We're still looking at - it doesn't affect the

NomCom (by this) being announced. It doesn't affect the announcement of the first of - I'm just trying to read through the schedule here.

Yes. So Mary Wong actually is putting this into the chat. And she's doing much better at it than I am. Next meeting is September 1. Deadline for documents is 22nd August. And we'll have time for SCI to finalize and Amr to send a motion for September 1 even if we open the public comment after Helsinki.

Rudi Vansnick: That's perfect. That sounds really good. So we have a solution for this phase. And I think that - well, I don't expect many comments coming from the Council in Helsinki on what we proposed. And based on the timeline, in fact the procedures only start at the (unintelligible) - I'm just looking through the schedule itself here.

It's (T) minus 30 days if I'm not wrong that it in fact starts to have an impact on the procedures itself. So in order not to have Wolf-Ulrich not being (able) and I would also not (unintelligible). And I think we did put if needed for this call to get to a final conclusion.

We know the next steps. The public comment period we start after Helsinki. It allows also ICANN staff to work on the document. As Julie has mentioned, it takes quite some work that needs to be done.

And I suppose that for our next call that would be the week after Helsinki somewhere on the Thursday also. I see Angie you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Angie Graves: Yes. This is Angie. I just noticed something in the email providing background. And if we are - I can certainly respond to this via email as well. But if we are making changes and reissuing this note, I just thought I'd make note of the fact that the members listed for Sub-team B differ from the members that I find in my mailing list for Sub-team B meetings.

Namely Amr and (Lawrence) and the particular emails I pulled up did not have Wolf-Ulrich in it but that just may be an oversight on my part. Thank you.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Angie. Rudi for the transcript. I think that we have enough discussion on the substance itself that in fact everybody knows what's on the table and the little changes that are mentioned will probably not change anything in view of decisions by the different participants.

So having gone through the agenda, I don't know if there is any other business that we need to take care of for this call. I supposed that I've taken care of what is needed. If there is no other business we need to consider, then I would say thanks to all of you for the participation to this call and all the previous calls and work we have been doing.

I would say congratulations to everybody because we went through a quite difficult step and we respected as much as possible the timing that is needed to get it done in a proper way. I see Julie you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Julie Hedlund: Yes Rudi. And I thought I heard you before mentioning having a meeting after Helsinki. Is that still anticipation because generally we try to avoid scheduling a meeting right after an ICANN meeting just because people are traveling back? I also don't know that we wouldn't - I don't know what we would have substantively to discuss at that point.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. Rudi for the question - transcript. Just in order to keep in mind that we would like to have this public comment publication done. Is there a need that this committee has a call before it happens or is that done by ICANN staff and we don't need to take care of that one?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie for the transcript. No, we - I there would really be no need for a call until the public comment period has ended or if there was a comment that came in that we felt needed to be addressed by the SCI.

So, you know, once we get the public period started, then we could just, you know, plan on having a call in August I would think unless something arose. So mid-August probably.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Julie. Rudi for the transcript. Yes. Well just let me know that we have some vacations planned in our schedule now. And I see that Wolf-Ulrich is asking if there is any other business on (stock) for the SCI.

As far as I have seen there is nothing on the table that we need to take care of. We'll see if in Helsinki they decide to put something on the plate again. But as far as I have seen there is nothing on the table. But I'm deferring to Julie to be sure that I didn't - have overseen something.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Rudi. This is Julie. No. There is nothing on the table and there's nothing anticipated that we as staff have heard of that's likely to be raised by the Council for the SCI at this point.

So really if there is, you know, until the public comment closes and if there are no comments then, you know, if there are no comments, we could probably even just close this out via email. There would just be - and the SCI could decide that.

But the next step after the public comment period is just a motion to go to the Council, you know, to have the Council go ahead and adopt the changes to the operating procedures.

Rudi Vansnick: Okay. Thank you very much Julie. Rudi for the transcript. Well with that, I think we can actually call this meeting to an end. And thank you all for the participation. Enjoy your afternoon, you're evening. Enjoy your (social)



responsibility meeting Lori. And we'll see those who are coming to Helsinki we'll see each other in Helsinki. Otherwise it will be in August somewhere.  
Thank you all.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you. Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks everyone. Have a great morning, afternoon, evening. Bye-bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings. Disconnect all the main lines. Have a great day everyone.

END