

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Monday, 14 August 2017 at 18:00 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. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ssc-14aug17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p7itd6rw6uv/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/fBMhB> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Michelle DeSmyter: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all and welcome to the GNS Standing Selection Committee Call on Monday, the 14th of August, 2017. On the call today, we have Susan Kawaguchi, Julf Helsingius, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Maxim Alzoba, Osvaldo Novoa. We have apologies from Frédéric Guillemaut. From staff, we have Marika Konings, Emily Barabas, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter. As a reminder to everyone, please state your name so it appears clearly on the transcription and I will turn the meeting back over to you, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you very much, Michelle and are there any SOI updates today? It looks like Maxim said no update for him. Anybody else? Not hearing any or seeing any hands up, we'll move onto the SSR2 review team. And do I have access to the slides or does staff want to just move the slides along? I think I do now. So the question is -- oh, Emily, you're going to move them.

So hopefully you've had a chance to review the information we sent out, both staff and I, and the leadership team for the SSE last week and sort of came up with a thought process on how to move forward with the SSR2 review team candidate. Emily Taylor has had to resign and she was one of our top three candidates from the GNSO Council, so now we need to look at the rest

of the remaining candidates that we recommended and name a candidate to the GNSO Council for that position.

And you'll see there that you should have had the link in the email but there's three candidates, Raul, Scott, and Norm. Richie has indicated he's an independent. Scott McCormick is from the BC and Raul is from the NCUC. So we need to decide on who would be the candidate that we recommend. Since we've recommended a full slate, I'm hesitant to go back to all of the GNSO candidates that were requesting endorsement. The previous -- it was the predecessor to the SSC that actually did this but it was the chair of the GNSO Councils, Vice-Chair, Donna, and several representatives of each of the constituencies or stakeholder groups that participated in the initial review.

So it looks like Maxim, you've said you've already requested guidance from the registry ex-com. So Julf, that's a great question on the diversity. That's always a struggle for these candidate selections. Staff, is there a possibility of putting up the full list of all the members of the SSR2 or provide a link to that for us?

So right now, from the GNSO candidates, we had James Gannon from the NCUC, Denise Michel is the BC member, and the non-voting member of the registrar. And I do remember that -- because I helped with the selection -- one of our top candidates was from the registry and I can't think of his name right now. But he was actually selected by another stakeholder group. So since one of our first three candidates was already going to be on the SSR2, we thought we didn't want to endorse a candidate that already had an endorsement and a seat.

So in that way, the stakeholder group was represented and I'm blanking on his name right now. Thank you, Marika. It was Erik and he was selected by RSAC. So in some ways, the group at that point that was making this decision felt that we had in our selection of candidates with James, with the NCUC, the registry, and the BC all represented, and Emily Taylor was from

the registrar stakeholder group. We do not in this list of the other three have a candidate from the registrar stakeholder group but I think that we can safely submit one of these individuals as the candidate.

So I was wondering if anybody had any ideas or thoughts on handling this replacement candidate in this way and wondering if we could move forward. Maxim, you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: As I understand, the current composition of the SSR2 is roughly four members from North America, four members from Europe, four from Asia-Pacific, two from Africa, and one from Latin America. And actually, I don't see just from the perspective of geographic diversity there is not much of a difference if it's going to be North America or Asia-Pacific because the current three candidates, one of them is Asia-Pacific from Pakistan and two of them are North America. I'd say United States and Canada or maybe Canada and United States.

So my thinking about this is that we don't have much of difference. We cannot apply the law of geographic diversity here because the choice is going to be more or less equal, like five candidates of Asia-Pacific or five candidates of North America is going to be the result. Thanks. And if I may, I'd like to add a few things about (unintelligible) but maybe I do it a bit later. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Or if you'd like to go now that's fine to discuss.

Maxim Alzoba: Given the materials the three candidates provided, my personal impression that the first candidate, (Raul Navid Bin Riaz) is a scientific kind of guy and as I understand, he had some ideas developed (unintelligible) but not referenced to implementation and loss of public activities. So what I can say good about this candidate is that he might have some I'd say more reasonable approach to statistics and what they do with it. Because it's not necessary that

technical guys understand statistics and mathematics as well as the professionals I'd say.

About second candidate, he was ex-tech guy in (unintelligible) with large businesses and United States government. Reading his resume about Scott McCormick and I'd say he knows the ecosystem and he is into the business, computer security. And the third guy is Norm Ritchie who is also ex-technician into computer security business and also he has GNS operational experience included in (unintelligible) key holder position. And he was involved in the (unintelligible) I see employees understand.

And the latter candidate adds something to the reviews, which could be applied better from operational perspective. With digits you can find lots of things like how some number relevant to other numbers, et cetera, but without understanding of how it could be applied we just receive scientific research. So my personal thinking that the first and the third candidates both can add something valuable to the group.

And I'd say the Scott McCormick, the candidate might add I'd say perspective from governmental point of view or large business point of view. So all three candidates in my thinking are more or less equal in the value they can add to the review team. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Maxim. That's interesting to hear the perspective and thank you for doing the homework and really looking at these candidates. And we have Renata has her hand up. Please go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you. I hope you all can hear me well. So my comment was general about diversity in the group and on the candidates as well. I took a look at diversity of backgrounds as well and I concur with Maxim that (Raul Navid) has a good academic background but I also saw activities in other organizations which can be quite interesting for the group and I

understand that was also a strong suit of the candidate who left the group.
So activities in (ENISA), (CARTF), other interfaces in the area.

So I would definitely highlight that as a plus that candidate would bring to the group in comparison to the ones that are already on the list. It is easy that there are a number of Asia-Pacific participants in the group but this number should be evened out I think with this candidate participating. That would be my comment for now. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks. That's good input too. Does anybody else have any input or thoughts about the candidates and welcome Poncelet and Lori. Sorry I missed you too Lori. And then how we should move forward in making this decision. I thought we had a hard stop or hard deadline to make this decision on the candidate today but Marika has proposed that we could provide a motion to the GNSO Council tonight at midnight I think is the motion deadline and -- but we could provide the motion to them, but not fill in the candidate's name.

And Marika, did you want to fill us all in a little bit more on that?

Marika Konings: Sure, Susan. This is Marika. So the indeed is that not everyone is on the call today and some further deliberation may be needed to come to a decision. But at the same time, recognizing that the deadline for motions for the GNSO Council meeting of next week is later today. The SCC would have the option to submit a motion that basically outlines what it has been tasked to do, but for now, just leave the name of the person you would recommend replacing Emily Taylor blank. So that would give you some additional time to either further deliberate, or conduct a survey, or discuss over email or potentially in another call, whatever you decide is needed. And then as soon as full consensus is reached, the person making the motion, whether that's Susan or Julf would then be able to fill in that name as an amendment to that motion.

That may allow for the council to consider a decision on this item during its meeting next week, while at the same time respecting the motion and document that, and providing potentially a little bit more time for the SFP to reach an agreement on a replacement candidate. I do know that submitting - the later the name is confirmed or submitted, it may of course then result in additional time that may be needed by the council to review. So as always, the sooner the better but this may at least give you the option to have a little bit more time to consider the different candidates and also respect input from those that may not be able to participate during today's meeting, or haven't made up their minds yet while still allowing for potential consideration during next week's council meeting.

So that gives us a breather and thank you for that. I was concerned that we would have to figure it all out today, which trying to get everybody's schedule and getting input can be difficult. It looks like we have some thought going on in the chat and Lori tend to leads towards Scott or Norm because of their practical experience. And Julf's point that Norm is an independent but that all (unintelligible) qualified.

Lori Schulman: Can I ask something?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure, Lori. Go for it.

Lori Schulman: Sorry I'm not great at the hand raising but we're a small group. I wanted to add too about Norm. Considering who we're replacing, I believe that Norm, if I recall, has the registrar background. So if we want to try to get a balance of talent maybe that's where we look. He's independent but if I remember right he's got a registrar background so I would consider that maybe even being a tilting factor.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's a good point. I thought he had a registry background.

Lori Schulman: I don't remember. I can pull up his resume and look.

Susan Kawaguchi: I looked at it earlier this morning and I don't know the details but it looks like Emily has put the link into his SOI. And so Maxim is saying he does have some registry -- he understands the registry backend. I didn't know that. He was the President of the registrar group.

Lori Schulman: That's what I thought I had read and I thought that if we're replacing somebody from the registrar group, even if it's not the group, he's got a background. It's a while ago. It's like ten years ago but it's something.

Susan Kawaguchi: That makes sense. And one of my concerns -- and I don't know (Raul) but I did review his resume and it does look like, as Renata had pointed out, that he has participated in a lot of different types of forums and groups and so hopefully is a very good contributor also.

Emily Taylor was acting as a co-chair and I also know Emily from when she shared the WHOIS review team, the first one that I was on. And so this is -- the SSR2 is really critical and we do need to pick someone who is going to participate and has a background of supporting whatever initiative they're working on and strong participation.

I know Scott because he's in the BC and I've seen him provide comments and lots of good insights to the BC and then Norm Ritchie has a great reputation too. I happen to just know them both a little bit personally. (Raul) I don't but that doesn't mean anything here or there. (Unintelligible) talking about the deadline here. Go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: I don't have really personal experience with any of the three. I was only going by what I was reading. As chair, would it be appropriate to ask you if you have to make a call today what would you do without binding you? I don't know any of them.

Susan Kawaguchi: Just from my own perspective, Scott or Norm would be easy to work with and I think they would follow through and participate. But like I said, I don't know (Raul). I think I would be more leaning towards (Raul) if we didn't have the geographical diversity already covered in the SSR2. But since that isn't an issue and there is no other woman candidate, because I always look at the gender diversity also, then to me, any of these three, I just happen to know Scott and Norm and know they would personally fit in with and work well on the team.

It looks like Maxim has a personal experience with Norm and he performed well. Oh, and (Raul) has been a fellow, which is good, and a coach. So what we could do is we should review the motion but we also need to decide -- Lori, you want to draw straws? That probably would work. We should decide on since we're not all on the call, Frederic is not here, we could do a short poll or survey to see where we're landing. Is there -- Poncelet is like draw straws.

Are we leaning toward anybody in specific? Do people want to say? So Marika, are you advocating doing the poll right now or just via email?

Marika Konings: You could set up a very short survey in Zoomarang like we've done for some of the previous ones where the only question is please rank these three candidates in your order of preference taking into account the criteria and qualifications for the SSR review team and give people a relatively short deadline that would also allow people like Frederic, I think he expressed his perspective on the mailing list, to respond. And maybe that would give a clear preference or maybe a small preference for one candidate over the other, although you may still need to deal with the eventuality if there is a tie between candidates on how to handle that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, and we do have consensus. So if we're agreeing to the survey with a ranking, would you like to -- we would have to give this a time

period. So do you think 48 hours is good enough? Maxim, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: I think that the idea with the poll with ranked approach we might have either one question, like have you read the materials. If you say yes then how do you rate the candidate, one to three. Two days, and I think it's enough because I will try to reach to the registries and registrar ex-com so they provide guidance to me and Frederic because after all, Frederic and me, we are just two (unintelligible). We don't (unintelligible) on ourselves. So I think it's a good idea. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: So you're advocating that everybody has to affirm that they've read the materials and then they rank the candidates. Okay, so Marika or Emily, can we set that up to go out and give it a 48 hour deadline? Okay, perfect. And then we probably should review the draft motion. I'm not sure that that was sent out to the whole SSC. And to your point, Maxim that the materials are only a few pages per candidate. Totally agree that we each should be reviewing those before we make a decision. And Emily is going to put up that draft motion.

The motion appeared pretty standard to me. It's very similar to what we've done in the past. Thank you, Emily. So I think we each should read this and decide if there's any changes today on this call because we'll have to submit this by end of day. So if we can agree now on this that would be very helpful.

I could read it out but I'm not sure that that's going to be any better than you each reading it yourself. And Emily will send it out to make sure that Frederic will have it, and anybody who wants to read it in their email. Okay, so we'll just give you a little bit of time to read it here. So Maxim asked do we need to add text that the fourth candidate expressed lack of interest.

Marika, is that something that you feel like is critical?

Marika Konings: I think we did note in one of the clauses -- I'm trying to see now -- number five expressed that they were still interested. So we thought that would capture basically that the person that's not listed there was no longer interested.

Susan Kawaguchi: I guess in some ways if we added his name and said he was no longer interested, I don't know, I feel a little funny about that.

Maxim Alzoba: I think if we don't mention it, it looks like we just forgot something. I understand from the logical point of view that saying that these three candidates were still interested by that moment of time. But I think since the fourth candidate said no, I'm not going to do that anymore, we might think to add it to remove necessity of additional clarifications and things like that, like what happened to the fourth candidate.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I guess we wouldn't have to state Howard's name. We could do something -- the following candidates that were nominated in the initial selection. Or we could change that to there were four candidates that were nominated in the initial selection process for consideration beyond those that were entitled to be selected, three expressed that they were still interested in serving on the SSR2. And then just name the three. Would that make it clearer? Or we can say three out of four. That would be fine.

So can we make an adjustment to this, to the fifth whereas clause?

Marika Konings: Sure. And Susan, will you be submitting the motion? Because in that case, we'll just get it back to you for submission later today.

Yes, I can submit it but just so everyone knows, I'm leaving on vacation on Wednesday so I will not be at the GNSO Council Meeting. So Julf, you will probably have to talk about it.

Marika Konings: In that case, it may make more sense to have Julf make the motion because if an amendment needs to be submitted later with a date if that's after Wednesday or if there are any further changes, it normally requires approval of the maker of the motion. So for practical reasons, it may be easier if Julf submits the motion unless of course Julf is unwilling to not available to do so.

Susan Kawaguchi: He just said he's happy to do it. That makes sense. So we can make that change and then Julf will get it and it looks like Lori is leaving on vacation too on Friday . And Lori, you have your hand up?

Lori Schulman: I think that was an old hand. I agree with the resolution. We should just say we contacted all who were qualified and expressed interest, just express it positively. That was all I think I was going to say.

Susan Kawaguchi: So we'll make that change. Was there any other edits that the committee would like to make to the motion? And Maxim says everything else looks fine. Okay. So we'll get that done or Julf will get it done. Thank you, Julf. I think you had to submit the last one too because I was somewhere and then Emily is saying we'll get this out to everyone to take a final look and Poncelet is fine with that. And I think we need to move onto -- so we'll get the survey out. We'll get the motion out and so hopefully be able to wrap up on the SSR2 selection and then we -- is there anything else on the SSR2, Marika or Emily, that we need to consider?

Marika Konings: I think the main question is following the closing of the poll, so I think we said 48 hours for people to provide their input, how do you want to proceed then? Staff can of course post the results and does the group then need further time to express their agreement with the outcome of the poll? Is there further time needed? Do we need everyone to respond on the mailing list? Is another call needed? How would you like to go about that as we are operating under the full consensus rules?

Susan Kawaguchi: Those are all good questions and me being gone on vacation, it's going to be a little bit difficult. I'm actually going to be out of the country so I'll have a little bit of difficulty of Wi-Fi and cell. And Julf with the WHOIS or the RDS selection, I wasn't part of that but last time we didn't wait for everyone to respond. So I think we should try to make sure everybody responds in that 48 hours and then with the aim to make a decision but if not everyone has ranked the -- if we don't have a consensus on ranking, how would the committee like to move forward? Do you think another call is warranted or do you think we could do this via email? And Renata, is suggesting we do the 48 hour deadline and then if we don't get everybody then do another 24. And then just make sure we have a clear reminder in the UTC time and date is Maxim's point.

So I would like to try to approach this with via email and see if we couldn't resolve any differences and come to a clear consensus. So I would say let's maybe publish the results after 48 hours even if everybody has not responded and then try to get other people, those that haven't responded we could reach out via email and get them to give them an extra 24 hours. But at least at that end of 48 hours, we'll know if we have consensus amongst those that have responded or -- that would be good too, Marika's suggestion of if there's any objections to the results of the poll.

Let's do that. That's a good path forward. As usual, Marika makes things move. And then if we don't have a consensus then we will either have to do it via email with a new poll or just simply come via email to figure out if everybody is now agreeing. So we're just going to do this via poll and email and see if we can't get an answer. I would say that we really need to provide this to the GNSO Council -- provide the candidate's name by Friday so that the GNSO can then go back to their own communities and stakeholder group constituencies and make sure that there's no problems with our recommendation.

All right, I think we've got a plan and now, we need to move onto the ATRT3 selection. We've got a lot of work to do. So in the slides, it looks like they've provided us -- so we have nine candidates and so this makes it a little easier because we can recommend seven of those. Of course, we have to come up with that top three. And staff has done their assessment and we can find all the information at that link. So we need to decide on whether or not we will get this done in time for the September GNSO Council Meeting or the October. And if Emily or Marika can remind me of the motion dates or the council dates. There we go. Thank you. You prepared all these slides that I'm just skipping forward and sorry about that but we only have 15 minutes left.

So if we review all the materials and have a -- get a poll out by next week of the candidate and then have a call to review and rank the candidates on September 6, the document deadline is September 10th and then we could -- and then if we don't get that done -- though Marika or Emily, we could use the same process we're using here. If we have the motion but haven't quite come to an agreement on the candidate, could we submit that motion with the names left blank and then still hit the September Council Meeting? Okay, so Marika is saying correct. So there's a little fudge room there that we could still get it into the council by September. I would like to aim for that but we could also -- if we can't come to an agreement -- then do that. Look to the October meeting.

And Renata agrees on the timeline too. And Maxim is wondering if you could submit the -- or you could send around the whole slide deck, which I think would be good. And Maxim, you have your hand up?

Maxim Alzoba: As I understand, we can expect some more volunteers as I hope I understood it right and thus, I suggest we start a relation by the plus one or plus two days after the end of the submission of the materials or applications. Because if we start reviewing by now, most probably we will give more preference to the candidates we see now. So I suggest we do it when we understand the pool

of candidates is finished and we should not expect any more. That's my thinking. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well, if you see in the chat, Marika has said that the ATRT3 has closed. That application period is closed and so we are limited to those nine candidates. And then she's asking about the GNSO liaison. That's an ongoing application period that's open. So then you're fine. So maybe we should move back to the other slides really quickly on the ATRT to just cover the requirements and thank you. So let's go to the next slide, the key questions that they'll answer.

Is ICANN transparent? Does the community know what's being decided? Is ICANN listening to all voices? Build the multi-stakeholder system. Is ICANN doing what it said it would do? If not, how is ICANN correcting course? So these are the three key questions that ATRT will answer so we should keep those in mind as we're looking at all of the candidates to see how they would fit in, in answering those questions. And let's go to the next slide.

And the focus of the ATRT at ICANN is executing on its commitments, decision making is clear, board performance, GAC interactions with the Board are transparent. Public input and comments are appropriately considered. ICANN is accountable and transparent, reflects the public interest, accountable to the internet community, and to examine the past reviews. Were the previous recommendations implemented? Did this make things better?

So that's a lot of work for the ATRT but that all makes sense to me. And then Lori is asking can you please post a link to the candidates. And then in general, what is a review involved for participants? Plan review, develop scope, key questions and project plans. Execute review. Gather feedback, prepare report, and deliver the final report, which seems so simple when it's on one slide but now being part of the second RDSRT that's actually a lot of work. And the next slide.

So general knowledge and expertise needed. I think this is really critical for us to find candidates that are going to have the commitment and time to participate. It's I think it's hard for people that have not participated before to understand what that really means but hopefully we have a selection of candidates that we won't have to worry about that. Team spirit, consensus seeking attitude, willingness to learn, readiness to contribute, objectivity, capacity to draw fact based conclusion and good communication skills using multiple methods and tools.

So these are key in core expertise that we need to look at in those candidates and the next slide. So to Maxim's question, how many do we need to select. The GNSO Council and the selection committee when it was developed decided that we would always select seven but rank the top three as those three -- to fill the three seats that were guaranteed. The hope is and the way the review teams were set up is that we might have the ability, the GNSO Council might have the ability to place more than three candidates on a review team if other SOs, the organizations were not interested like in the review team, the RDS review team, you'll remember the CCTLDs had not placed any candidates on the team. But they also did not hand those seats over to the GNSO Council to fill.

So we always select seven. We indicate who the top three are so that those will fill the seats but we have the other four in reserve just in case, in this case with Emily having to resign, then we have a pool of candidates that have already been reviewed and selected. Or if one of the stakeholder organizations says fine, we don't -- we're not going to fill all our seats. We will allow you to use one or more of our seats, which also happened on the -- it was on the WHOIS review team or the RDS review team. So GNSO Council got four.

And Maxim, do we have confirmation from particular GNSO bodies about the support of ATRT3 candidates? And Emily responded, we just received

confirmation, individuals who are members of SGBs, the wiki will be updates shortly. Right, and we don't ask if they're support. There's just to see if the affiliation. I really think that's the role of the committee is to go back to their own SGs or constituencies and make sure that the candidate that has applied is someone that the specific SG or C does endorse so that you need to talk to your own communities about that.

And Marika is pointing out there is no requirement to be affiliated though I do think it makes it easier when you back to your own community that if it is a member of your own community in the BC, or the IPC, or the registrar or registry group, that it's easier because you know them to recommend them. And also Norm is really an example of that. He is an independent but he's also known in the community I think is one of the reasons he was added to that.

And Maxim said it was questionable about Erika but it worked. That's good too. I think our next step with this is to everyone to review the materials and be ready to submit their responses via the poll. And then we can move on with a meeting. I think it was on the 6th. So is there any other questions about the ATRT process? Yes, Renata, I think we always should be looking at diversity. I think gender and geographic. Maxim would like to include supporter affiliation. I'm not..

I think that is a separate conversation that Maxim and I are having in the chat in relation to whether someone has to be affiliated or a member of a stakeholder group constituency. Maxim can correct me if I'm wrong. I don't think that was related to the poll necessarily.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And Emily - I'm sorry, Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Actually, I'm just trying to follow the logic. In case of seats located to GNSO, it should be either support or affiliation because those candidates are relevant somehow to (unintelligible) because, if, for example, we see

something like we saw with RBS review team where some candidates were not affiliated or were confused about their location in the structure of ICANN system. So that was my thinking.

Susan Kawaguchi: I understand that and I think Norm Ritchie comes to mind for me because in talking to my own constituency, Norm Ritchie was a known quantity even though he wasn't declaring himself as part of the registrar, or the registry, or the BC. But because he's known in the community, the BC was fine in endorsing him as one of the candidates. So I guess it depends on your community and who it is. I think it's harder for unknown quantities.

So we've got three minutes or maybe less than that, two minutes, and Emily, your turn.

Emily Barabas: Just wanted to ask a question about the structure of the poll for the ATRT3 appointment. Do you want it to be structured similar to the RDS poll that we did or are there tweaks or a different structure that you'd like to see for that?

Susan Kawaguchi: I did not do the RDS poll or fill out the RDS poll. Does anybody have some comments on that on what we would like to see in the poll?

Marika Konings: If I can maybe add to Emily's point, what we can do is set up the poll in a similar way as we did for the RDS review team and then make it available in preview mode so that then gives the group an opportunity to review how the poll is set up, make suggestions on how we may improve, or change, our add to it and then we can launch it. Maybe that's a way for someone -- for people to concretely see how it could be structured but also then make suggestions on how it may need to be adjusted to give results that are easier or more workable for the group to review.

Susan Kawaguchi: And it looks like we plus ones and agreeing. So let's do that. I think that's a great suggestion in the preview mode. That way if there are any suggested changes, they can be made easily.

All right, and since out of time or almost, we'll have to -- the timeline for the cast liaison selection. So the application period will close in September so there's not anything we can do on that but that's a suggested timeline. Since everyone has the availability to the slides, if you have comments on that timeline, let's do that on email. And then we also need to review the SSV standard process document and adhere to that. If there's any more edits or concerns we should also talk about that at the next meeting.

And I agree, Maxim, it would be great if we have at least one candidate for GAC liaison. Any other questions or concerns today? And we need to review the charter. Okay, we'll set up a time to do that in September. Okay, if there's nothing else that's burning and that we have to cover today, I think we'll call the meeting to a close and appreciate all the input and the discussion today, and looking forward to the SSR2 replacement candidate poll. Thanks all.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thanks, Susan. The meeting has been adjourned. Operator, would you mind stopping the recording for us at this time? Have a great day everyone.

END