
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Thursday, 20 August 2020 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: 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.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on the agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/MgObC>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call taking place on Thursday the 20th of August, 2020, at 14:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio, could you please identify yourselves now?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes. I'm only on the audio.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. That was Julf Helsingius. Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription and recording purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to Julf Helsingius. Please begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Well, thank you. Thanks, everybody, for participating. Can we ...? Yes, we have the agenda up on the screen. Great. So, again, welcome, everybody. As you can see, our agenda is pretty short at this point because it is really a preliminary thing to set up for the real discussion.

But as a formal point I, of course, have to ask all of you if you have any SOI updates. Anyone? Sam, is that ...? I see something. Oh, no. Okay, it went away. Clearly, nobody has anything, so we can move on. So, Emily, could you walk through us how we tend to record and publicize the discussion so that everybody is aware of how that happens?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. Sure. Hi, everyone. Welcome back to the SSC. So, Julf asked me to just run through, because I think some of you are new to the SSC, a little bit about standard practices around privacy, and transparency, and how the SSC works with respect to that.

So, as a default, generally speaking, the SSC errs on the side of transparency. So, like many working groups in the GNSO, that means calls are recorded, those recordings are posted on the Wiki, and that meeting notes are taken.

Although, anything that is very detailed deliberations about a specific selection process won't be captured in the notes. However, if someone is very interested in hearing everything that's said on a call, they can go back and listen to the details of the call and access that.

As a general matter for selection processes, the materials, like application materials, are also publicly posted on the Wiki, unless there is a specific reason that that information needs to be private, and there is a private Wiki that can be used for that purpose, but we're not anticipating needing that for this process.

We're going to talk a little bit about using a survey tool for everyone to organize their thoughts about the candidates. The results of that will be posted on the mailing list. The mailing list is also publicly archived.

So, that's just a note that everything you share here is more or less accessible to the candidates and anyone else who is interested. So, I just wanted to make sure everyone knew that, and if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them, or Julf can answer them. But hopefully, that gives you a little bit of a sense of it. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thanks, Emily. Yes, that was exactly the point that you should all be aware – that's of what you say here will be scrutinized afterward. I don't think any of us are going to say anything very controversial, but just in case, it is good to be aware of it.

And I do have to say that, when I was actually picked to this process for the current job three years ago, it was interesting to go back and read the discussions that I, of course, couldn't be part of at the time.

There wasn't anything really controversial, even, it was just amusing. Let's put it that way. Right. So, review of assignment. Emily, is there any way you could put it on the screen? Because I

tried to open it in my web browser right now and I got a “temporary maintenance” notice.

EMILY BARABAS: Oh, dear. Julf, yes, let me give it a try and see if it works for me. That’s not the most comforting. Let’s see if this works.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Well, it’s good that they do occasional maintenance.

EMILY BARABAS: Are you able to see this, I’m assuming?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes. Yes, it looks good.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. And Julie has just dropped the link, as well, into the chat. Hopefully, it works for at least some of you, or otherwise, maybe try again in a few minutes. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yeah. Exactly. It’s exactly ... That means that I got a maintenance message on the top. It might be very temporary, so yeah. Of course, I do assume that you all read it in advance, anyway. So, do we need to walk through it or are you familiar enough with the content of it? Anyone want a walk-through? I don’t see any hands.

But also, just as a very short comment, this is, again, a fairly interesting role. All I can say from my own experience is that the requirements are interesting in that they are looking for a person who is really up to date with most of the PDPs, knows what's going on in the GNSO Council, but can also keep track of what's going on with the internal politics in the GAC and discuss with the major decision-makers there.

A lot of it is really back-corridor work, rather than the usual participation in the actual meeting. But in the meetings, whoever gets selected for this position will have a very, very busy time because they are generally expected to be in two, if not three, place at the same time almost at every point in time.

So, if you have any questions about the role, I'm happy to answer based on my three years of experience. But otherwise, I think we all understand what we are trying to find here. That's all. Again, questions welcome.

MAXIM ALZOBA: If I may?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Please go ahead, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Julf, do you think something is missing in the description? I mean in the formal call for volunteers. I understand that whatever we find here is going to be relevant because we can wait on the items which

are posted in the call for volunteers, but do you think something is missing here?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Well, yes. Okay. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. Thanks. I actually just wanted to provide a little bit of context in response to Maxim's question. This was actually something ... As the council leadership was getting ready to put out the call for volunteers, I was revisiting the "Call for Volunteers" text and thinking, "Oh, are there some things that need to be clarified here?" and so forth.

And we went back and looked and, actually, all of this text was adopted by the council in ... I guess it was when the role was launched as part of the consultation process between the GAC and the GNSO.

So, that was around ... When was that? FY 15 or so? So, we're not really ... Because the text itself of the call for volunteers was adopted by the council, it was really released again, this year, in the same form that it has been in the previous calls.

So, any changes would require, I guess, re-adoption by council. So, that's kind of why this is the way it is. So, in terms of changing the requirements or something like that, that's not really something the SSC is in a position to do, at least for this round of selection. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Emily. That is a very good clarification. And then, also, as a bit of a background, it was also interesting that, three years ago, when I started in the job and started asking, “Okay. So, where is this job really, formally defined?” pretty much everybody was saying, “Well, look at the [request for] candidates. It’s all in there.” So, this isn’t just a normal request where we sort of put in a wish list. This is actually kind of a formal document. We should all be aware of that. Okay. Marie, I see your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Julf. Can you hear me okay?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yeah, perfect.

MARIE PATTULLO: Great. Thank you. First up, Julf, I think you have done an amazing job on this for the last few years. Watching you scurry between meeting rooms has been quite entertaining for us. But seriously, this is what I’m trying to wrap my head around, and you can tell me if I’m wrong.

I’m wondering, how much would you say it’s a GNSO role? How much would you say it’s a “being in the GAC meetings” role, on behalf of the GNSO? In other words, do you think you spend 50% of your time with us and 50% of your time with the GAC?

I'm just trying to get a handle on how much time you think should be allocated to both sides of the equation. And—this is the bit you'll tell me I'm wrong—you don't vote. If I remember correctly, this is a non-voting role on council?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Correct, yes. It's a non-voting role. It's purely an advisory role when on the council. And so, to answer your percentage thing, I would say at least 80% of the time should be spent in the GAC room, because that's where this person is needed.

MARIE PATTULLO: Interesting. So, 80%. Eight-zero percent. In other words, the vast majority of the time, ICANN meetings, you're in the GAC room.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes.

MARIE PATTULLO: And God bless you, because I've seen you in every GNSO Council meeting. So, you must have had no sleep for like the last three years.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, I did need to be in two places at all times.

MARIE PATTULLO: No, thank you. I appreciate the clarification.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yeah, sure.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: But also, to clarify, that's just during the actual meetings. And of course, the virtual meetings have made that much easier because there is much less things going on on top of each other. Between the meetings, there is not much actual GAC work. There is a little bit of e-mail exchange but, actually, very, very little. So, between the meetings, you are more GNSO. In the actual meeting, you spend the time in the GAC room. It is also interesting to know that the GAC liaison is not on the GAC mailing list.

MARIE PATTULLO: Right.

JULF HELSINGIUS: So, from the GAC's direction, there is only e-mail when they feel that they need to contact the liaison.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. So, just to close that circle, you are also invited to their closed meetings, or not?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Only when they decide to invite.

MARIE PATTULLO: Got you. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Sure. Okay. Carlton, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Hi, morning. Thank you, Julf. I wanted to bring up the point that most of the activity is going to take place in the GAC meetings, and there is very little that we can do to ... There is very little intersessional conversation.

So, I think, just to point out that, the time you spend as a liaison, you're going to have to spend a lot of time in the GAC room, because if you want to know what's happening with all the political wranglings and so on, that's where you have to be. So, maybe just to point out that you will have to ... When you go to the meetings, it's more GAC than GNSO—if you want to do the job right, that is. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Exactly. Thank you, Carlton. I do also want to point out that, between the meetings, I have tried to participate in those national GAC pre-meetings that I have been able to participate. So, mostly Netherlands and Finland. Because in many countries, they do organize a national pre-meeting for the GAC people in that country a couple of weeks before the main meeting. Right. Carlton, I see

your hand is still up. Do you have a new comment? No? Thanks.
Okay, Philippe, go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Hi, everyone. Just a thought on the way you proceeded. My question was more on the last few months and the fact that we're now virtual, as we say. Has anything changed? I guess everything has changed. But is there anything specific you'd like to raise as to [what you did] in face-to-face meetings may have become even more difficult, and in what way? Or is there something specific to the GAC liaison?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Well, yes. Thank you. That's a really good question. I think it really depends on the person coming in and how well they are already familiar with the GAC and the people there. For me, it was easier, because I already had two years of experience. So, I knew who to talk to when there were issues.

I thought, if you're not familiar with that, the only way to get to know that is really the pauses between the meetings and going and talking to people. And that is, of course, much harder now when it's virtual.

On the other hand, as I mentioned, it's so much easier, the virtual, not having to physically run between different meeting rooms, and there are much less things scheduled overlapping. So, yes, exactly as you wrote, you do need to network. That's a very good way of putting it. Thank you, Philippe.

What I would also like to add is that I think this is also a role where the actual role is being redefined all the time and as things evolve. When I started, it was very different from how it is now, mainly because a lot more happens now directly between the leadership teams. There is much more active communication directly without having to go through the liaison.

So, I think the coming year is also going to be a revisiting of the whole role, and maybe even redefining it. So, I think the next liaison will have a large role in redefining the whole liaison role. Any more questions? So, Emily, could I ask you to walk us through the process of how we put together the web system to allow us to do the selection and evaluate the candidates?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. Sure. Let me just pull up ... Can you all see the proposed timeline, now? Lovely. Yeah.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, thank you.

EMILY BARABAS: Yeah. So, the SSC has a pretty standard process for selections in general, and then, because it has previously done a selection process for the GAC liaison role for Julf, we have a little bit of a template that we can work off of in terms of processing schedule and so forth. So, I wanted to just run through this briefly with you, and then we'll get some feedback about some of the specific parts of the process.

So right now, we're just getting an overview of the assignment and getting everyone together to start the process. So typically, in SSC processes, a survey tool is used, like SurveyMonkey, for each individual member to organize their thoughts a bit go through the applications, think about the qualifications of the candidate and record that to share with the group.

So, what would be ideal is if we could come to some agreement on what's in that tool before the selection process starts in September, and we have actually a preview of what we used for the 2017 process. I'll just drop it into chat, and we'll also send it around by e-mail. So, you can take a look at that and see if you think that's fit for purpose or if something needs to be changed. But if everyone is comfortable with this sort of thing, we can use that for this process, as well.

So, SGs and Cs are submitting applications up until September 1st. That's the deadline. All applications should be coming through SGs and Cs. By then, we should have the survey tool ready.

Typically, if it's possible to give a week, a week is a nice amount of time for everyone to be able to go through the applications, and hopefully that's enough time for everyone to organize their thoughts a bit and submit responses. That leaves, between September 7th and October 7th, roughly about a month for the group to meet, to discuss. And then, the SSC makes decisions by full consensus.

So, the goal is to reach full consensus on a recommendation of a single candidate to put forward to the council. And the goal is that the council will consider the recommendation in the 21st of October council meeting, which is at the Annual General Meeting, and the

deadline to submit motions, which is the way that the recommendation will be submitted, is October 11th.

So ideally, the SSC makes a decision just in advance of that, can confirm with the candidate that they are still available, and then submit that motion. So, that's a proposed timeline for your feedback. I see that Maxim has his hand up. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'm afraid that the text of the call for volunteers says "may" in the part where it describes that SGs and Cs "may" send candidates. In registries, we understood that as a situation where SG can send or may send, but all candidates are expected to send it individually, because of text which doesn't have wording saying that only the applications supported by SGs or Cs are eligible. So, I have serious concerns if we try to say that only candidates whose text was sent through SGs are eligible. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Maxim. That's a really good point, and I didn't realize that that ... I clearly should have read the communication more clearly. Yes, the question is, can we [adjust that receipt] by communicating clearly to the SG and Cs about what they expect [inaudible], or do we have to live with the current situation and say, "Okay. If somebody nominates themselves [apart from] this process directly, we will have to accept it." Do we have opinions on that?

EMILY BARABAS: Hey, Julf. If you don't mind, I'll put my hand up, as well.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Please, go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks. So, this is actually something that came up internally with staff, as well. Unfortunately, the call is a little bit ambiguous in its language. So, when we were talking to the SO/AC support team about how to process this, we were kind of also trying to figure out exactly what this meant.

Our understanding, even though it says "may," was that the standard process was that the applications would be submitted through SGs and Cs. So, I think that the SO/AC support team currently is ...

If someone individually submits—I don't believe they have received any applications yet—the SO/AC support team would say to them, "Can you please submit this through your SG and C?" But if the SSC feels very strongly that that shouldn't be the process, I think that it's maybe something that needs to be coordinated with the council leadership as the owner of the call for volunteers. But happy to, obviously, take inputs and follow up.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Well, thank you. I see several hands. But before I actually give Carlton or Maxim the turn, I would like to say that it is, of course,

very optimistically assuming there will be a lot of applications. I hope we are right. I think Carlton was first, and then Maxim.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Julf. I wanted to pick up on Maxim's, because this is something I noted, too, but I kind of went at the issue a little bit from the left side, because I asked whether or not we should not have a question in the survey to see if the candidate was supported by the SG and C.

The way I read it was that you should have some support, but it was not necessarily so, but if you have support from the SG and C, it would carry some weight. Hence, my thinking of putting that question directly in the survey that we use to evaluate, but now I gather that we may have to do something else. So, it is a question that I think needs to be figured out before we get much further. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, and I agree. Maxim, do you have anything to add to that?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I suggest that, if we have more than one candidate, we regard this as an additional value. For example, if we have three candidates and two of those have support of the constituencies, for example, then we might add something to say that, yes, they are more preferable.

But we will, whatever we decide, need to send communication to the GNSO leadership and to the chairs of SGs and Cs because it changed the approach. For example, in registries, we had our meeting last week but we will not meet until the next week when it is going to be a bit late for support.

So, it's going to be an urgent e-mail conversation, I think. And in clear language, we will need to say that we regard the support of constituencies as like ... Yeah. The belief of the constituency that this person might perform ... Yeah. Fine. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Right. Thank you, Maxim. So basically, we should regard it as an endorsement. Okay. So, that implies that we will accept applications that come past this official process because there is unclear communication, but we might then really rely on the endorsements as a very important judging criteria. Does anyone have a problem with that approach? I don't see any hands. Oh, Emily. Please, go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Julf. I just wanted to make sure ... Before you make a decision on that, I just wanted to confirm with SO/AC support colleagues that they have not gotten any applications yet, because if someone had already submitted an application individually and they had said, "No, you have to go through an SO and AC," I just want to make sure that the process is consistent for everyone who has applied, if anyone has already. But I think the answer is no.

Oh, and Terri is confirming no applications have been received. Then yeah, I think the SSC, in coordination with the GNSO Council leadership as owner of the process, I guess, would work out what exactly you would like to do and how to do it. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Right. Thank you, that's very helpful. I see Maxim's question in the chat, which is a really good one. So, Emily, or Terri, or whoever, what would be the process for getting that communication out to the SG and C leaders quickly enough?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. So, I guess we would just want to clarify ... So, just to confirm that I understand, the idea is that it would be optional for applicants to submit through the SGs and Cs, but they could also do so individually? Did I understand that correctly?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, plus we would urge SGs and Cs to endorse their candidates.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. I did also want to mention, just as part of this, that this call for volunteers hasn't been publicly posted. It was just circulated through the SGs and Cs, kind of with the assumption that the SGs and Cs would be managing their candidates. But it is possible that SGs and Cs circulated the call more widely for people to submit applications individually.

So, I did just want to mention that, that it's not like the word has been spread widely on websites and things like that for candidates to apply. But I think the process would be that we would just confirm with council leadership that they are okay with this approach, and then draft a quick e-mail clarification to send out to the SG and C leaders.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Right. Exactly, yes. Good. I see Maxim has his hand up but I was going to say, actually, picking on the point he made earlier, that at least one group has already had their meeting and didn't realize that they needed to pick a candidate to endorse. But Maxim, do you want to clarify on that?

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's a bit worse. We read the text. We had [few tens] of lawyers at that moment on the call, and we decided that the text clearly says that the application should be sent directly by the applicant and there is no need for endorsement this time.

That is why I suggest, if the communication to the leaders of SGs and Cs is sent, the text is clear: "Please send us endorsement for your candidate or candidates." We don't know. Maybe some C/SG thinks that they have, for example, two really strong and good candidates. Why not?

Because they understand that those people are eligible for this role and they might perform fine, and that the application itself might be sent directly, but the copy should be sent via SG. So, to ensure that SG or C see the same application as sent to the secretariat to avoid

a situation where the person sends application text one directly and application text two to SG/C, or ... Yeah. Whatever. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yeah. Thank you. That is a really good point. So, yes, it does sound like we need to get an e-mail out very quickly to clarify the situation. We need to be able to deal with candidates that come completely past the process but, of course, those who are endorsed by their own groups are in a much stronger position. Is that the consensus we can decide on? I see no hands raised. Right. So, Emily, I'm sorry. I think you will have to draft an urgent e-mail and consult with the leadership.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. No problem. We can certainly do that. And of course, we'll run that by you and Carlton, as well.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Great. I appreciate that. Thank you. Right. Do we have anything else we need to discuss at this point? I think the most important thing is [to see] what is in the preliminary tool and can comment on that.

So, if anyone has things, additions and so on, they should, of course, let us know as soon as possible. Looking at the questions in the chat, yes, I guess instructions should ... Well, they should also instruct the individual candidates to seek their endorsement, but also tell the SGs and Cs to endorse the people they think are their candidates. Maxim, is that a new hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes, it's a new hand.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Please, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I suggest we add something like it's a clarification to the text sent prior to this one. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Sounds reasonable. Thank you. I also see Marie asking about languages. Marie, do you want to speak to that?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Sorry, Julf. I was just thinking about the role in the practical term, and my assumption would be that somebody who has two/three minimum languages would certainly be a benefit. I don't want to close this out, obviously, if we get a great candidate, but I'm thinking if we only, for example, have somebody who speaks English, would we be trying to tease out, in the survey tool with the questions, their language ability to be able to have conversations with different GAC members?

JULF HELSINGIUS: It is a good point and yes, definitely, being multilingual does help. Although, I can say that if [some of those] languages are ones like

Swedish and Finnish, it doesn't help you that much. But yes, we might even put that as an evaluation criteria in the actual form, language skills. I'm not sure we can ... Because we, basically, are going to make our decision just based on the application, we can't verify those skills, but we can at least rely on the skills that people put in their application.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Thank you. I mean, clearly ... And I understand Maxim's point that it wouldn't be a valid reason alone if we get the best candidate, but I am thinking of various GAC members who would not feel comfortable speaking to a so-called liaison if they weren't exactly sure of what they were saying. So, I'm just trying to think of bridge-building.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, good point. Rafik, your hand is up. Go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julf. My comment here is just we need, really, to stick to what was described in the job description, that it was agreed and discussed between the GNSO Council and the GAC years ago within the process that trying to build the different mechanisms to help us to work with the GAC and to involve them in the policy discussion.

So, we need to stick to what we have in terms of the criteria, the skills, the expectations, and so on. I can understand the different

section, here, but I think it's coming at a late stage and it's putting more barrier than is really helpful for us.

We need just to ... The Standing Selection Committee is supposed to do one thing. It's to do a selection represented by all the parts of the GNSO, and it had to follow the different criteria that are already set. So I want, really, just to focus on that.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Rafik. That is a very valid point. Thank you for reminding us of that. Thank you. So, any other points? Anything else we need to consider at this point?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. Do you mind if I just mention one other thing?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Yeah. I was just going back to the process from 2017 for the call for volunteers, just because this has been so consistent over the last year is because of the framework that the document was created under.

And it looks like in 2017 it was enforced that candidates submit applications through the leadership teams of the SGs and Cs – so, if a candidate submitted individually based on their interpretation of

the call for volunteers that they were redirected to do so through the SGs and Cs.

So, this would be different from the way that it was done previously, so I just wanted to flag that when we raise it with council leadership as the owner of this process. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. Yes, that is appreciated. Okay. Maxim, you're the person mainly flagging this issue. Do you think that is something you could live with as well, if we just decide to go for the old model and if we only accept applications through the official channel?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Hi. I think, since the previous communication was clear—or not clear in the process but not prohibiting the applications to be sent—my suggestion that, in case of endorsement, a copy of that application should be sent with the e-mail from the constituency should resolve this.

We will accept everyone but we will just value better the applications with endorsements. Because it's not good to say that, "Okay, we accept anyone," but then to send clarification in just a short notice saying, "No, no, no. Wait. But only those who are going to be sent by constituencies are going to be valid." I don't think it's a good idea. We should honor our own communications language. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Right. Thank you. Emily, addressing your points, I think the real issue here is that what Maxim is saying is that they already had their meeting and they thought that they don't need to formally submit anything, that they are perfectly happy letting their candidates go individually and submit.

So, I do get Maxim's point that we might have to allow that because we are so far in the process already. Thank you. Thanks for your comment, Emily. Yes. If you can help explaining that to the council leadership, that would be helpful. Of course, we also have Rafik listening in, so he will hopefully understand the situation very well.

Right. Anything else on the agenda we still need to address? We talked about the selection process in general. We haven't gotten, apart from the schedule, into specifics, but I think that is all based on the tool. So, Emily, anything important I missed?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. I think we have covered everything, and we'll follow up, as well, on the item discussed here.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Great. Appreciate it. Thanks. So, does anyone have any other business they want to bring up? I don't see anything. So, in that case, I'll just thank you all for participating and I hope we're going to have an interesting process ahead of us. Thank you, everybody. Stay safe. I hereby close the meeting.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, all. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned.
Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and stay well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]