

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Monday, 05 November 2018 at 17:00 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ssc-05nov18-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p2hbseazqu5/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/MxW8BQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call held on Monday, the 5th of November, 2018. On today's call we have Susan Kawaguchi, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen and Frédéric Guillemaut. From staff we have Emily Barabas, Marika Konings, Steve Chan and myself, Andrea Glandon. We do have apologies from Rafik Dammak.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this I will turn it over to Susan Kawaguchi. Please begin.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you so much and thanks, all, Wolf and Frederic, for joining, and all of staff as usual. I think the first order of business this morning was just reconfirming leadership for this committee. And I'm going to let Emily handle that.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. This is Emily from staff. So this is just a small proposed adjustment to our agenda for today to touch on leadership composition in addition to talking about the ATRT 3 selection. And noting that we're a small group and that Wolf-Ulrich is actually an alternate for the selection process, it might make – oh, and Maxim is here as well, although also an alternate for

the selection process – so it may be that we just introduce the topic and then continue the discussion over the mailing list.

But because the year has ended with the AGM, Maxim is no longer officially on the SSC as a permanent member. He's staying with us for this current selection process as a substitute for Erica because she's a candidate for this process but he's no longer going to be a vice chair.

So the question for discussion here is first, Susan has expressed a willingness to stay on as chair and so it would probably make sense to do an informal reconfirmation of her role as chair; and then also it would be great to select a vice chair from the current group of SSC members. So noting that the only person who would be eligible on this call would be Frederic, I don't know if you're interested in volunteering but otherwise we can take it to the mailing list for both items for further discussion.

((Crosstalk))

Emily Barabas: Frederic, your hand is up.

Frederic Guillemaut: Hi, well (unintelligible) I would volunteer for that but maybe we have a few more people coming up and bringing the call and the mission, not really up to the task of leading the team. Yes, let's take it to the mailing list (unintelligible).

Emily Barabas: Okay, Susan, does that work for you as well?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, that absolutely works. And if no one on the call that is opposed to me just go ahead and acting as chair today until we've reconfirmed that.

Emily Barabas: Perfect. Maxim says, "Can we agree that Susan is the best chair of this meeting?" And I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Emily Barabas: I don't see any problem with that. So just so that it's not awkward for Susan to send that follow up email, staff will go ahead and do that and call for both volunteers to serve as vice chair and also any objections to Susan serving – continuing to serve as chair.

Susan Kawaguchi: Great. Well and thank you all for your support, I appreciate that.

Emily Barabas: Great, so I think we can move onto the main agenda item which is the ATRT 3 selection. Susan, did you want staff to do a little intro on that or is that something that you wanted to do?

Susan Kawaguchi: No, I think well maybe really quick, so I think everybody – or maybe not Wolf, I'm not sure, was on the first round of ATRT selection but that was over a year ago. And so, you know, now we need to reconsider and look at all the candidates, the new candidates and the old ones again or the previous ones, let's not call them old. And make a decision and provide a new slate of seven candidates for the team, you know, obviously with the three candidates, the primary candidates, you know, in Positions 1, 2 and 3, that we know would be placed on that team, and then with the hopes of the other four candidates being selected if there is a need to fill other seats.

So I hope everyone did, you know, had the time to go through and fill out the survey. And thank you very much, staff, for putting that together and making it so simple to review. I didn't do it until late last night so hopefully you got mine and was able to, you know, that we do have some statistics to look at. I'm a little concerned we don't – we're missing two groups at least, the IPC and the – and Rafik couldn't make it for the NCSG, so, you know, maybe we won't be able to finish our deliberations today but at least we can get moving and a head start on those and finish them on the mailing list.

So do you have any other comments, Emily? And then maybe you could tell us what, you know, what the survey results were.

Emily Barabas: Sure, Susan. This is Emily Barabas from staff. So just wanted to highlight a couple of questions that came up over the mailing list that people flagged with respect to the selection process that we can also discuss as we go through the survey results. One was a question about the extent to which endorsements should be taken into account, and just to provide a little bit of context on that one, the endorsement piece was not part of the selection process in 2017; it was something that was suggested since the GNSO was actually doing a slightly more tailored process this time and realizing that time is quit short for the selection process, you know, that it might be helpful for SGs and Cs to provide endorsement for candidates as an additional consideration.

So noting that this is not a perfect science and, you know, it's really up to all of you to determine how much to weight that as a factor that was something that a few people raised both in the survey responses and also on the mailing list.

Another thing that came up during the selection process was we got a couple of late applications that were just a day over the deadline. I don't know how much people want to worry about that or consider that, but it is something that came up.

And then finally there was some discussion about the overall composition, whether we're just filling in the gaps for selections that were – the candidates that were no longer able to serve or if we were actually reconsidering the entire slate. And again that's something that the SSC can decide. The primary task is to fill in the gaps essentially but to the extent that filling in the gaps might create a sort of an upset or an imbalance in terms of skills or representation, the SSC is welcome to adjust the entire slate. So but that also might be something that folks want to consider as we go through the discussion and I think is also somewhat reflected in the responses.

And I see a question from Maxim who says, "Please include Erica into email search for volunteers for vice chair position. I believe she might be excluded from the SSC list until the end of the ATRT 3 selection." Yes, thanks, Maxim. I will make sure that Erica and also Osvaldo are included in the message about that; they're temporarily off the list for the ATRT 3 selection, so thanks for that reminder.

And, Wolf-Ulrich, do you still have a question or a comment? I saw your hand a moment ago but now it's down. Looks like no. So for now I'm just going to briefly run through the survey results and then perhaps we can open it up for discussion and further comments.

So five people responded, which is not, you know, everyone in the SSC but it did give us a little bit of an indication of what people are thinking and for those who had an opportunity to respond I know the timeframe was really short and we really appreciate your responses. You know, rather than going through each and every question I can kind of list out the rank for each question but I think maybe it makes sense to just kind of go to the final pages where members actually ranked the candidates.

And I think what you'll see is that for both of those cases where members were ranked on skills and experience and also on attributes, there was a pretty clear top three and that was Wolfgang, who is an existing candidate from the last round in the top three as well, and Patrick and Osvaldo. Patrick and Osvaldo are both endorsed candidates, Patrick by the Registry Stakeholder Group and Osvaldo by the ISPCP.

And when we have a top three we don't actually have to rank those among each other, it's just those are the three that the GNSO has selected as the primary. So noting that those all came in pretty close to one another and kind of came out as clear kind of highly ranked individuals that might be something to consider as the group deliberates further.

Then kind of going onto the group that were in the next set of readings, there was sort of a cluster that were very, very close together in terms of ranking and that was – let's see – Michael, Erica, Adetola and Jacques. So Michael, Adetola and Erica were all three the sort of secondary candidates from the previous round and they're all clustered quite closely together and still sort of seem to be kind of in that middle section for this poll as well. And Jacques is also sort of closely included there – in there a little bit lower and also with Brian.

So and then there's sort of a cluster kind of at the bottom of the poll rankings and that (unintelligible) and (Shirley) and (Rollie). So at least from these initial results there seem to be like some pretty clear trends in terms of primary and secondary candidates and I can actually pull up what that would look like in terms of representation and geographic balance but there is actually a fair amount of diversity when things shake out that way. So I'll stop talking and I see Maxim's hand is up and then we can go from there. Thanks. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Do you hear me?

Emily Barabas: Yes, loud can clear.

Maxim Alzoba: Okay, last time when we had the selection for this group in the end it was to have seven seats where three are, yes, real ones and four are kind of hot seats or urgent replacement, things like that. I suggest we keep it the same way in our recommendation. It's first thing. The second is I believe it could be a good idea to – we should have votes of all SO SGs made by the representatives to be cast. So I'm not sure how we do it, maybe we reach to email – by email to the candidates who – not the candidates, to the representatives who didn't have a chance to vote. I'm not sure how we do it but still I think it might be a good idea. Yes, ask Susan. Thanks.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Maxim. And I think one thing that we could consider is for this group to just in the interest of time rather than reopening the poll because the poll is

not an official vote, it's just the way to start the conversation, this group could propose a line-up and then put it out to the mailing list for people to respond or object to so that might be a way to move the conversation forward for those who don't have time right now to do a poll or to join this call so that's just a suggestion.

Wolf-Ulrich, please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Hi. I have two questions. One question is with regards to the support of the – of SGs or ACs of candidates. I'm not sure so whether we had at all in former times or maybe we had in other circumstances in other points or elections the support necessary. And the question here is to me also whether it should be necessary or not. So from a first – so for my first thinking I would say it would be helpful if there is support given by an affiliation, you know, where these people are affiliated to, either the SG or constituency, also I think that would be helpful to the ones who – to our committee to see that support.

The second thing is the question with regards to the evaluation you did in the survey, I was, you know, I was writing also in my comment that I would see the following so from my point of view because as I don't know all the candidates, but I think, you know, I was ranking the most – the two candidates where I was mostly in favor of, there was Osvaldo and Wolfgang and the others I ranked, you know, in an equal – kind of equal ranking. How did you take that into consideration? And was that possible because the questionnaire or the survey didn't provide for that.

And then how did you come to the result of the ranking here, the first three, Osvaldo, Wolfgang and – who was the third one – and Patrick? That is not very transparent to me. Thanks.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Susan, did you want to go first or should I respond to that – to the questions first?

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh, please go ahead and I have some other questions.

Emily Barabas: Great. So, yes, so the first question was about the ranking. And, you know, the way the poll was organized was that for the final two questions each of the members were asked to rank to the extent possible each of the applications in order of preference based on the criteria. And so the poll results kind of reflect what was entered into the poll. I don't think that there was a way to enter them all equally in terms of the ranking; it was sort of a forced rank where each candidate needed a rank so between 1 and 11.

So the results reflect that. And if you feel like there's an inaccuracy in the way that was captured, you know, we can talk through that. And we don't need to consider these numbers to be, you know, the be all and end all by any means, it's really just a starting point for the conversation. Or we could remove your response although then we'd have to change the poll if you wanted to rank everyone equally. So I think it might make sense to just use this as a starting point for conversation and talk about the candidates and not think of the poll results as being kind of the result of a vote necessarily.

In terms of the scoring, the Survey Monkey tool actually has sort of a ranking that they do where each rank has a value so, you know, a number 1 score has a value and a number 2 rank has a value and number 3 has a value. And the more people who give a candidate a higher rank, the higher the number is. So that's sort of where this ranking came from. And again, this is not an exact science, it's not a vote, it's really just to start the conversation and get a sense for trends and also to ensure that members read the materials and think over the candidates so that there's something to talk about.

If it's helpful here in the agenda pod we have the Wiki page of the selection process and that lists all the possible candidates if you need a quick reference to the affiliations, who's endorsed, so forth and so on. So I hope

that's helpful as clarification. Again, you know, the poll is just to get the conversation started and certainly not an end point. Susan, please.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, Emily. That was helpful. And it's Susan Kawaguchi for the record. So one of the things I think we sort of jumped over was the late applications. You'd asked the question whether those should be considered or not. I went ahead and considered those but would want to hear from others if they also felt like, you know, being a day late was fine. If not, then we're probably not really reviewing the same list of candidates and maybe as a team we should – or as a committee we should make a decision on that.

And then the endorsements, it seems to be that like there's a, you know, some are endorsed and some aren't so I don't know how that should fit into our review and analysis here and I would like to hear from others too if they have thoughts on those things.

Emily Barabas: Maxim, please.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. First thing I'd like to know that we were trying to find the replacement for the vacant seats and if (unintelligible) only then we resort to thinking about the overall change of the slate of volunteers. (Unintelligible) I mean, that not a single representative of SO/AC said that Wolfgang has to be replaced. I do not believe anybody said that. So I think that the number one from those three seats should be kept. Yes, he had the best score in this, unfortunately not full voting, yes, but anyway, it means that he's still on the top, yes, is the first thing.

The second thing, as I understand, Registrar constituency send their endorsement on 30th of October and I think they had some kind of confusion about the endorsement and expression of interest. So I am not sure that we need to deny the candidates supported by constituency because it was sent on 31st. First of all to avoid situation where there will be non-consensus in SSC because I believe we would face it.

And the third thing is about difference of candidates, for this particular selection for this year, since we are filling the vacant seats, three vacant seats, I believe, the best priority according to the expression of interest call text where it clearly said that the – we can check it on the website and where it was like priority to be given to the endorsed candidates, I'm not following to the letter but the idea was like that. So I believe we need to honor what was in the call for candidate. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, Maxim. And I agree that, you know, our – this is Susan for the record, by the way. I agree that, you know, our recommendations that we made over a year and a half ago should be honored. And have no problem personally leaving Wolfgang in as one of the top three. Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks, Susan. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. To your questions of the delayed applications, I don't have a problem with that so I would just say okay, include it, so in the selection. With regards to the question of – and of replacing vacancies or looking to the whole slate, I would say so it would be easier from my point of view just to look what has to be filled. If we have already candidates from the former slate, you know, who have signaled that they would also stay again, so why not to leave them here? And then just look at what is open, what are the vacancies and we have to fill them. So that is my personal opinion on that.

And you were also asking with regard to endorsement, well, as I said, I personally feel that it's helpful to see whether a candidate has the endorsement by the related affiliations, where he comes – the related constituency or SG, where he is affiliated with. That's, well, I feel that's helpful to me personally. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Wolf. And that is helpful. Emily, I'm a bit confused though on the endorsement because the previous candidates I think you said we didn't have

endorsements. I happen to know, for example, that Adetola had the BC endorsement but I don't know that that was recorded anywhere. So I'm assuming that that could be the case for others Cs or SGs.

The other question I had was which – so at least there's two constituencies or SGs that did not fill the survey out. Could you tell me which one it is – which ones it is, Emily? And please go ahead, Emily.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. This is Emily Barabas. So the question about endorsements, so there wasn't an official way to endorse a candidate in the application form. There was just an opportunity to state an affiliation and that was confirmed. If we are indeed only going to fill vacant spots and not sort of compare old and new candidates, then maybe the question of endorsements matters a little bit less because we don't have to compare apples and oranges, right, the existing candidates sort of stand where they are and then the new candidates we're comparing those who are endorsed and those who are not endorsed.

So that might simplify things a little bit because I know it can be a little confusing to think about where endorsements needs to fit into this when there wasn't an official way to do that in the past. So I don't know, hopefully that helps a little bit.

And in terms of who filled out the poll this time around, let me pull that up and I will put it in chat in just a moment. Frederic, did you want to speak up?

Frederic Guillemaut: Hello. Frederic for the record. If we look at it from a, you know, a more relaxed point of view we need to select three candidates, (unintelligible) four other candidates if I understand well (unintelligible) there to replace people. And from the four then we have three candidates and four that will be ready to replace them – only five – only five. So to me it looks quite good.

And we should use that for, you know, to send out the mailing list and then ask people if they agree with that because the three people that are leading,

one is Wolfgang and we have (unintelligible) and the three candidates are endorsed by their constituencies or SOs. So it looks pretty simple and good to me, but maybe I'm too simple. But (unintelligible) of the four are really, really good and strong basis, send out to the mailing list and ask the advice of the other people. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: So that makes sense to me too. This is Susan for the record. And I think we're, you know, at least within – on the call we are somewhat in agreement on the sort of the candidates that we may endorse to go forward with this. Maxim, do you have comments?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I'd like to support Frederic.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So and I should know this, Emily, and as you can tell, Emily, we can't do this without you. So did we – in this list that you gave us in the ranking just from the ones on the call or the ones that we're actually able to do the ranking, did we leave out any candidates that were – that we recommended to the GNSO Council last time? I know Adetola and Erica were on the list before and Wolfgang was obviously in the top three.

Emily Barabas: Yes, Susan, thanks. This is Emily Barabas from staff. So in the poll we actually included everyone in case there were members who, as they went through the applications, felt that things really needed to be completely changed. And I can briefly run through who the new and old candidates are, but this list includes all of them so there were one, two – I'm just looking at the full selection list here. There were originally seven candidates. We needed to fill three slots and then there were two additional applicants that were not selected in the last round; those are also included although they ended up pretty low at least in the survey responses and didn't have any SG or C affiliation listed. And then there were a total of six new candidates.

So if we did the simplest thing, which would be just to fill in the gaps, we need to fill two primary candidates and it does look at least based on what people

have said so far that there's a pretty strong feeling in the direction of filling those slots with Osvaldo and Patrick so from the ISPCP and the Registry Stakeholder Group. So maybe we could start with that and see if – how people feel about that as sort of the primary three since those are the ones that will definitely go forward and then maybe we can talk about the additional candidates that would be potentially selected by the SO/AC leaders if, you know, for diversity considerations or so forth because those are sort of in a second tier.

So what do people think about that? Those are – Patrick and Osvaldo are both – they're both endorsed, they both seem to be regarded pretty highly in terms of skills and capabilities. Does that seem like the slate that people are comfortable with in terms of representation diversity, skill diversity and so forth?

Susan Kawaguchi: So this is Susan. Actually I probably didn't ask my question very well. And I just didn't want to dig through my emails to find it because I know you – last night I remember there was a list of the original four candidates from our selection that were left and able to participate, and I just wanted confirmation of who those four candidates were. I think I know three, but I wasn't sure on the fourth.

Emily Barabas: Oh, sorry. I'll pop it into chat right now. Apologies.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry. And then – because what I, you know, I'm really hesitant in doing is if we had selected a candidate last time that we remove them if they're still, you know, if they've waiting a year and a half and if they're willing to participate I'm a little apprehensive about removing someone we selected before and replacing them with a new candidate, except in some ways we need to really look at all candidates, you know, that we have now. So I'm not concerned about the order of them too much. So, Maxim, please go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Looking at the list of the candidates and after checking of the expressions of interest of all those for my point of view it's (unintelligible) it seems to me that even the numbers of the ranking are still the same for those candidates. So I suggest we do not touch it because the expressions of interest are still relevant to the selection; they showed their willingness to follow the course and to help the cause and to say more they waited for one year. So in my opinion it's a good sign that those candidates, yes, are still relevant to the selection and I do not believe we need to remove them, at least I don't see a single reason to do so. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: And this is Susan for the record. I absolutely agree with you. And it looks like we haven't in our selection so, you know, when I was reviewing, and this is just my personal experience so everybody has their own, but in looking at the candidates we chose before, you know, in the top three was Brian Cute and – Cute, I'm never sure on how to say his name, and so he was CEO of the dotOrg registry so when Pat Kane's application, you know, showed up it made sense to me to sort of insert him – Pat in there in the same position that we had Brian because of the topic of this review team, it made sense to have that high level registry representation.

So I am actually fine with what this survey is showing and the candidates that, you know, the top seven candidates that are selected. And so I guess the decision is now whether or not we just send these to the mailing list and get the input from the other members that couldn't make the call and decide this on the list. Anybody have any thoughts on that? Maxim, please go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually it's not about being like part of the big registry. It's about experience – relevant experience in management, in audits, in the multistakeholder environment, at the same time as having, yes, knowledge of how registries work. So it's not just one big registry replace other big registry. We are talking about (unintelligible) and I believe that Pat fills the gap which was left after Brian left this team, I mean, team of candidates.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's a good point, Maxim, and I appreciate that. And it looks like Frederic is saying, you know, let's send this list to the, you know, the selection of candidates to the list for further discussion and decision. So that would be in the top three Wolfgang, Patrick Kane, Osvaldo Novoa, Michael, Erica, Adetola and Jacques. So does anybody disagree with that list? And, Emily, please go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. This is Emily Barabas from staff. I'm just pulling up what I think where we landed. So the only question I think is, you know, for these top three, the rank – or the order doesn't matter at all, they're just the three selections. For the alternate candidates the rank actually does matter in terms of kind of order of preference, if you choose to have such a rank. And from the previous selection I believe that there was a vacancy sort of in the top slot that was Tatiana and then Michael, Adetola and Erica were there. Based on the poll results it looks like Jacques was kind of a little bit below or we could just – so we could go with this or we could reorder those if you wanted to put Jacques kind of at the top of that alternate list. Just want to make sure I know what to send to the group for further reaction. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Emily. Go ahead, Maxim, and then I'll add my comments.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I suggest that we add some kind of asterisk saying that endorsement was not required in the selection of the previous year to avoid confusion that endorse candidates or some reason are lower than others. And for example, Erica was candidate in last year and had endorsement this year. So and also I suggest that we add small note to our letter to GNSO Council saying that additional seats – candidates from additional seats should be taken to primary seats, taken into account the composition of the team and the diversity or something. So it's not the order we have right now who's going to be the real replacement but the actual need of GNSO Council and ATRT 3 team. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Maxim. I'm not sure I agree with you on that. I think we should order the last four but willing to discuss that. Frederic, please go ahead.

Frederic Guillemaut: Thank you, Susan. Frederic for the record. I would think differently from Maxim. As you said earlier, Michael and Adetola, they've been waiting for one year, they're still here to serve so (unintelligible) to have them as a third and fourth – fourth and fifth position, the replacement. So the order here is fine for me. But still at some point as you can see there are two candidates that have been endorsed are below. I think that's a shame.

But for next time maybe we should be clearer and ask for endorsements directly. That's a good lesson for us for the future. But if I look – I just had a look – had the other notification from last year and Michael and Adetola are the same ones (unintelligible), they are the people that are not available anymore. So I like it that way. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay thank you. So maybe what we could do is when we send this out to the list, you know, we, you know, say Wolfgang, Pat and Osvaldo are the top three, you know, which are – will be seated for sure, and then at, you know, well obviously we're going to ask the rest of the committee whether or not they agree with our assessment on these, on all of the candidates we're listing in this top seven. But then ask them to rank the other four because the top three don't have to be ranked, right, for selection in case we do – we are able to fill additional seats.

So we could, you know, I mean, in some ways when you look at this, you know, there's no registrar candidate that's in the top three and there's no BC candidate and there's no IPC candidate at all. You know, so we could reorder that but then we run into the fact that Jacques, you know, is a new candidate and Michael and Adetola and Erica have been waiting a year.

So, you know, I understand Maxim's point of view that, you know, whichever candidate is selected should be fit into the team, the whole team selection,

but I'm not sure that, you know, then that leaves that up to the review team to tell the GNSO, you know, which of the four remaining candidates they want. Not sure that that's what the GNSO would want us to recommend. So if we send this out with the top three sort of as a slam – or just asking the question of do the other two members agree with that, and then on the other four candidates if they agree with those four candidates if they do then they should also provide ranking maybe.

Maxim, please go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think my suggestion caused some controversy so I suggest to remove it and to leave the order which is, yes, going to be calculated by the end of our selection. That's it. And if GNSO Council, for some reason, decides to do something beyond our recommendations, okay, it's up to them to decide, not up to us. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: That makes sense too. And I appreciate that. So I think we have agreement then on the list of candidates to send out to our mailing list for further discussion. And then so Emily, what other step? Yes, please go ahead, Emily.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. This is Emily from staff. So just to confirm what – where I think we've landed is to have the sort of top three primary candidates in no particular order to the SSC list and then the additional candidates in no particular order also put to the SSC list and ask the SSC members if they have a particular preference in terms of order of those candidates.

I think the next thing we need to talk about is timeline. Yes, and Maxim, I will add something as well when we send this out to the SSC members noting that for the existing candidates there was no process for requirement for endorsement.

The next question is how quickly we think we can wrap this up noting that the deadline for the GNSO was technically October 31 and I think the GNSO Council is able to do an electronic vote on the selection process in mid-November. Is it possible for – to try to wrap this up and come up with a recommended slate by the end of the week or what do you want to set in terms of the deadline for making that final selection? Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well personally I think that we could, we definitely should try to wrap this up by Friday but would like to hear from the rest of the members too. Anybody against trying to do this by Friday? You want to put a green check or a red check? And Frederic, please go ahead. Oh, green check.

Frederic Guillemaut: Frederick for the record. Yes, I just wanted to say that yes, I agree, we can send it tonight the list and have a discussion for two days and maybe we can just (unintelligible) by Friday, it's possible, so let's do it.

Susan Kawaguchi: I agree. Okay, looks like we're all in agreement there. So, Emily, I'll work with you on that, getting that email out. Is there anything else we need to discuss? Okay, nothing from the staff side. So I thank you again for your work on this and all your thoughts and, you know, evaluation. And I'll try to get this email out soon, today, I'll definitely go out in the next few hours, and then hopefully we can spark some more discussion with those that couldn't be on the call today and make a decision. Thanks so much. Have a good day. I guess the call's ended now.

Frederic Guillemaut: Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END