

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee call
Thursday, 5 October 2017 at 19:00 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-05oct17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p891o5tzgib/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/uQ-fAw> 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.

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all and welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee Call on Thursday, 5th of October, 2017. On the call today, we have Susan Kawaguchi, Frederic Guillemaut, Maxim Alzoba, Tony Holmes, Julf Helsingius, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Lori Schulman. We received apologies from Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Rafik Dammak, and (unintelligible). From staff on the call, we have Marika Konings, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please mute your phones and microphones to avoid background noise and also remember to state your name before speaking for recording purposes.

And now, I'll hand the call over to Susan. Thank you, Susan. Please go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Nathalie. It looks like Lori would like a dial out if you could handle that for her. Okay, good. And so let's just move forward with the SOIs. Anybody have a change to their SOI they'd like to announce? It doesn't look like anybody is putting their hand up so I think we're okay on that.

So thank you all for filling out the survey and joining the call so that we can make the decision on the GAC liaison position. We had three candidates and it was Julf, Osvaldo, and Wolf. And so we can quickly just go through the -- I think everybody should have scroll capabilities so if you just want to -- it looked like we had seven people fill out the poll, which was good and that everyone reviewed the material.

So on Question 3, based on the application materials and your own knowledge about the candidates, please rate the candidates, and it looks like Julf came in with the highest rating also -- I'm sorry, I said Wolf was the candidate. It's Paul. I'm a little bit out of sorts here today. So -- and Maxim is making the point that it looks like Julf has the majority of the numbers in favor of Julf, which is true. And if everybody has reviewed this, Julf came out as the lead into Question 4 and Question 5, Question 6, and Question 7 and 8.

So Julf is the clear leader but I thought if anybody wanted to have a discussion on the candidates in general, does anybody have anything they'd like to say and it looks like Marika is saying only two (SSA) team members did not fill out the survey, Poncelet and Carlos. And Maxim has also pointed out that Julf has the support of three SGs. So the BC registry and registrar stakeholder groups.

And Frederic got a plus one there. So I guess the question is does anybody oppose Julf being the candidate we recommend? Lori, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Lori Schulman: Yes, can you hear me?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, we can.

Lori Schulman: Thank goodness. Can you remind me, these recorded (unintelligible) is public, correct?

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

Lori Schulman: Anybody can access them at any time?

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct.

Lori Schulman: So I'm careful with my words, that's all. I think that's important because it's people's feelings. Yes, and I will say this, I did discuss this with the IPC and the IPC is very strongly supportive of the NCUC candidate, Paul. And I know Paul is the only one on the list who has not been a counselor and there's definitely that gap.

On the other side of things, he's been so actively involved in the accountability talks. He is keenly aware and adept at sort of the interplay between the GAC, the Board, and the GNSO when it comes to new bylaws, and I think he could be a very creative and not just I -- I'm speaking on behalf of the IPC -- but we believe he could be a very creative and interesting choice for the GNSO rather than picking someone who fits a very classic mold, for lack of a better description.

And so I did want to at least talk about it.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And that makes sense.

Lori Schulman: Rafik is I don't think on the call, but Rafik represents NCUC and I do believe he's their candidate or the NCSG candidate. I forget which way they categorized him.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well, personally, I didn't know Paul and I did get some of what you were saying from his materials, not as strong of an endorsement. Does anybody else have thoughts about Paul? Maxim, as I understand,

qualifications required experience and devotion in matter of (unintelligible) and participation.

Lori Schulman: Right, and Paul has been a very diligent contributor to the whole accountability discussion. I guess my concern is, and I think I mentioned this on other calls as well, there's sort of results that you could almost predict and I would hate for this group to be that. That if we don't start looking at candidates in a different light, I think we are kind of confined to old patterns. And I would at least like to talk about it. If the numbers overwhelmingly support Julf and the constituencies overwhelming support Julf, of course we wouldn't want to deny that opportunity to Julf. He's very likable. He's very congenial to the group.

In terms of diplomacy and advocacy, I can't really speak to that. I haven't (unintelligible) at council meetings necessarily.

Susan Kawaguchi: Marika is also pointing out that Julf was also endorsed by the NCSG and that they endorsed both candidates, Paul and Julf. The BC endorsed Julf. Paul did not come to the BC and ask for an endorsement (unintelligible) reached out, and neither did Osvaldo. Osvaldo is also part of the CSG and usually, I get my marching orders from the BC on who's endorsed on our -- in our deliberations. Maxim, you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. The way I voted, I actually was instructed by (unintelligible) and yes, it's not my personal opinion. I shared my ideas on how to vote. It was corrected by (unintelligible) so it's not my personal opinion. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right, and that's the same situation with me, because Julf had come to us, the BC, and had asked for our endorsement and we gave it. So therefore, so I want to say Osvaldo I had ranked almost as high. I think Osvaldo also would make a good candidate. I think we have three good candidates we have to decide. And then Tony's saying no candidates came

to the ISPCP. Of course, we know Osvaldo very well as one of ours and most of us know Julf well too.

Okay. And then so Lori Schulman says if not Paul, then IPC supports Osvaldo and that the IPC ranked the candidates. Tony is typing. Lots of people are typing, multiple. If anybody would like to speak too, just go for it. And Marika is noting that we do need to reach a full consensus on the decision. So Maxim, you have your hand up?

Maxim Alzoba: As I understand, we have somewhat similar situation to what we had in the previous, yes, voting process where we had station where we would like to see some fresh blood from outside. But the way questions were created actually led to station where, yes, effectively we need to find the person who fits the position the best way and is appropriately supported.

So I understand the idea of thinking about letting less experienced and maybe less qualified for the position person too, but debating the process (unintelligible) in the process but I'm not sure the GAC and GNSO would be happy to be, I'd say, the subject of education. So yes, thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: So that is a good point. In this position, and maybe it isn't a position where one can learn because it is pretty involved and the GAC has their own requirements and they provided -- the GNSO Council and the GAC drafted the criteria for this. And Tony is saying that too. I believe this role is too important for fresh blood unless they are very well ranked against the agreed criteria.

Go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: I'm sorry, we're a small group, I'm sorry to talk over you, Susan. But I just want to speak to that with some seriousness because fresh blood I think does not categorize Paul category. If you look at his resume, his accomplishments, his policy strengths, he's very, very strong on policy. He's

a highly regarded professional. So I would be very careful about categorizing people who aren't necessarily in the GNSO at the councilor level necessarily fresh blood. They might be fresh blood to the council but I think there are a lot of people out there who want to get more involved, do more, who are very strong either in the academic field or whatever professional field they have. And if we keep knocking them out, I don't think that bodes well.

Susan Kawaguchi: I would agree for most for the review teams and I think I made that comment in the last call when we were selecting the ATRT3 candidate that we had some eager candidates that are willing to get in and really work hard, but having -- they have never been on a review team before. So they didn't have that level of experience but if we don't allow someone to come on. But on a review team, you have minimum, what, 12 candidates or positions to fill. And so I think there can be some time for a candidate that has all the skills needed, but a little bit of time to come up to figure out how a review team works.

In this position, it is just one person and so it is someone that would have some experience with working with the GAC and the GNSO. But I agree, we shouldn't just look at a minority of the criteria involved. We should look at all of it. Frederic, you have your hand up.

Frederic Guillemaut: Hello, I was just about to say something but Marika said kind of the same thing, she wrote it. Partly one of the expectations is a good knowledge of the PDPs of all this work in progress. So maybe the (unintelligible) that Julf has is good advantage I would say. You need to maybe know more into details what PDPs imply (unintelligible).

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you and Marika did point out the same thing, the significant experience and knowledge of the GNSO policy development process as well as recent and current policy work under discussion and/or review in the GNSO is important.

And so Maxim is asking do we know which PDP Paul participated in beyond the mentioned one. So Lori, I guess he has had a lot of experience with the CCWG in that IANA transition?

Lori Schulman: Yes, the CCWG and he has served as -- I guess I liked his resume. He served as acting assistant secretary for international affairs and homeland security. He's got very deep government experience and I think for getting into the head of governments that's very important, I would almost argue more important than understanding the GNSO PDP process, which he's a smart guy and he could figure out.

I'm looking at the experience qualification a little differently I guess and the IPC generally. I mean I'm saying I here, but I am representing the IPC when I say these things, that you can learn enough and know enough having gone through, I think, the accountability process. Yes, the PDPs are something special and their development, adoption, and implementation follow along the lines of the GNSO rules and procedures. I get that but for someone with Paul's background, I don't think that's something difficult to learn, or understand, or understand that there's a lot of give and take on the multi-stakeholder side of a PDP. Because the same give and take has been there for CCWG.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, and the CCWG was a little thornier than some PDPs in my opinion. And so Marika has pasted some helpful reminder into the chat box. I'm not going to read that out. I'll let you do that. Maxim, you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: I wanted to underline the reason why I think we do not -- GNSO doesn't have time for learning curve here. One of the most important topics for the whole (unintelligible) system, I mean GDPR is something between GAC, and ICANN, and registries, and registrars. And I'm not sure we can afford as a committee a delay here. The reason is without registries and registrars, who given the current state of affairs will disappear by the end of next year

because not many of our companies will survive 20 million euros (unintelligible) and the current structure is not well designed I'd say.

And this position, for example, given that yesterday conference call with (Jorgen) and it came to the situation where it was a clash between GAC and ICANN. I think we need to understand the importance of time here because it's less than half a year left. I mean almost half a year left for a resolution. So I wanted to underline the importance of absence of learning curve here. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I understand what you're saying. This position is a little different, though to take Lori's point of view, Paul may not have the GNSO experience but the CCWG experience that was pretty much in depth and a lot of work and you would have to understand ICANN in general to have done that work.

And Marika, you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you Susan. This is Marika. I tried as well to post it in the chat but it kind of cut off so it may be helpful as well to remind everyone of the scope of this role, because I think it's important to understand at least from what I've seen and also having been involved in the GAC GNSO consultation group who developed the criteria that this is really intended as an information sharing role, bringing information from the GNSO to the GAC and taking information back. This is not intended as a kind of facilitator, or negotiator, or any kind of that kind of role.

So I think you need to be very clear in that those are as well I think very strict instructions that will need to be provided, whoever is selected for this role, that that is the objective. Because that person doesn't have a mandate on that, that may be specifically assigned to facilitate on some of the thorny issues that may exist between the GNSO and the GAC. The person is

normally involved and that's also something, for example, that I've seen in relation to one example, the IGO discussions.

But this role has never been intended, as far as I understand, to be a negotiator on behalf of the GNSO because that's just not the mandate that is given to this role. It's purely to facilitate the sharing of information and ensuring that the GAC has the information about the relevant or different PDPs that are ongoing and is able to provide input in a timely manner, and able to take back questions to those efforts or to the GNSO so that that information can be provided.

So I just wanted to provide that bit of context as you discuss the different candidates.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Marika. That's helpful. And Maxim is suggesting that we recommend to have an apprentice like position. That's something we could think about and refer to the GNSO Council and Marika's response to that, that's probably not something that's currently foreseen. And Tony too. It's always good to think outside of the box, Maxim. You just never know that (unintelligible). Lori, you're up.

Lori Schulman: I was going to say, I think if you have the apprentice and it presumes a GAC liaison elect, which I don't know that even the GNSO rules would allow at this point without some altering of the agreement between the GNSO and GAC procedurally.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right. So...

Lori Schulman: I think it's a good idea. Maxim I think is getting to the heart of the matter. To be able to have a deep bench, right, because I think that's really all I might be saying and I've said in other calls about trying to bring new people in, or even if they're not new in one context, new in another for lack of a better word because I don't think Paul is new. He's been following these issues for many,

many, many years and we have a deep respect for him in terms of his understanding of procedure and the law, and as I said, the interplay of the GAC with the board and the GNSO. And while I understand that the liaison position is more about reporting, I think there's ways to report and the way you carry yourself professionally and how you convey messages that is quite important to this liaison role.

So while I would agree, it's not a strong advocacy role, a negotiating role, it is setting a tone and setting a mood for cooperation. And to your point or someone mentioned the IGO/NGO issues and now the GO issues, there's going to be a lot of back and forth between the GNSO and the GAC. And so I see this GAC liaison role being, to Maxim's point, quite critical. And the IPC's reservation is that Julf may not have the temperament for it. And if there's an agreement or consensus that Paul may not be the right person, perhaps we can look a little more at Osvaldo.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And Tony's making the point I was just going to make. We do have three very good candidates which is a good position to be in, but it does make the choice difficult. We also have responsibility mandated by our charter to come to full consensus. So we need to figure out a way to get there and Maxim, it looks like you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: As I understand, the initial requirements led to the situation where at least somehow qualified candidates appeared because they will never have support of constituency without at least some degree of knowledge. So yes, I understand that we have three good candidates but the degree of support is different and I think qualifications are different.

I think what we can do is to refer to the previous situation where we said that -- wrote that yes, we see lack of fresh people in the room and that we just say that it could be a good idea to at least discuss the idea of an apprentice like position. So we are not insisting on implementing right now, but we're suggesting to explore the idea basically. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That is a good suggestion. Lori, is that a new hand or an old hand? Okay. Old hand. And with the ATRT3 candidate that we referred back to the GNSO council, I also delivered that message that we were looking for more a variety of candidates and so hopefully the different stakeholder groups and constituencies will take that to heart.

Also, I think the candidates themselves need to step up and be a little more proactive (unintelligible) better too. And so it looks like Lori is going to get some information from the IPC leaders. And Marika, not sure can talk, but we did...

Marika Konings: I'm still here but I've just dropped off the internet. There's a big storm here going so I think it will muck everything up. But I'm still on the line and I'm taking notes in the background.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Well, let me ask you a question then because Carlos, who was representing Julf's position, I mean taking his -- replacing him for this deliberation because Julf recused himself obviously. And then Poncelet did not -- the two of those did not fill out the poll. So we gave adequate time and notice. I'd hate to delay this too much longer but is it a possibility that we try to get them to give input to see if that changes the ranking of the candidates?

Marika Konings: I can reopen the survey again and I do -- as you all know, we send several reminders and I also reached out to them individually without a result. So we can open it again. Maybe, Susan, if you reach out to them directly maybe that has a larger impact than when they get a message from me. So that's definitely something the group can consider doing.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. I can definitely reach out. Can you remind which community Poncelet is from?

Marika Konings: I believe he's NCSG if I'm not mistaken.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. All right, and I know Carlos had -- I think he was sort of off the grid. Had quite a bit of something going on where he could not participate at least last week. So Tony?

Tony Holmes: Can you hear me?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I can.

Tony Holmes: I have a few reservations about going back with the poll now to two people who didn't complete it because before they complete the poll, I've no doubt they'll read through the manuscript of what we discussed here and I think that places them in a slightly different position from those of us who voted beforehand. So it's not going to be filled in and completed on the same level as it was with the other people who completed that beforehand and I think there's an issue around that.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's a really good point and I had not thought of that. Okay. And so Poncelet may be from MPOC. Maxim is (unintelligible). So Frederic, did you want to go ahead?

Frederic Guillemaut: I just wanted to add also that even if we have two more voters, if it changes, even if we choose Paul, for example, that means we won't have any consensus by the higher (unintelligible) for one of the candidates but it will not help us with consensus I guess. Or do you think so?

Susan Kawaguchi: I really wouldn't know but if one candidate came even higher in the ranking is what I was thinking, but then Tony's point about they've seen the regs results may bias them, which makes sense, even if it wasn't intentional bias. It's just they've seen -- they could listen to the call. They could see the ranking as it is right now. So it may not give us any additional information to see a clear cut candidate.

And Tony is that an old hand or a new hand? Did I cut you off? I didn't mean to if I did.

Marika Konings: Could I get in the queue as well, Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure. Why don't you go ahead, Marika?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Susan. I came back and I had dropped off again. I just wanted to remind everyone as well of the (unintelligible) that was set out and in principle, the original timeline foresaw the SEC coming to conclusion by the end of this week to allow for reaching out to the number one candidate to confirm that he or she, in this case only he, would still be available, which then would allow confirming the proposed selection by 11th of October and then the SEC being able to submit a motion in time for the next council meeting, not the upcoming one, but the one in Abu Dhabi, which is I believe the 16th of October. Actually I have to double check that or Nathalie can check what the motion deadline is.

I think there's a little bit of flexibility in there as you may not need that many days to confirm with the person whether they're still interested as well as having to submit the recommendation before you submit the motion. But I just wanted you to be aware of that timeline and consider indeed what you can do to meet it because if it is not possible for the SEC to meet that timeline, it basically means that it will not be possible to nominate a new person by Abu Dhabi, the time by which Carlos will be stepping down. And I think as most of you know, he's actually taking on a new role as Nom Com appointee to (unintelligible) council so it may mean then that the position is left vacant for hopefully a short period of time unless there would be agreement both from Carlos and the council that he could fulfill that role on an interim basis for a little bit longer.

So just wanted to share that with you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And that is good for us to keep in mind. We do have a timeline and we should try to stick to it. So Maxim you have your hand up?

Maxim Alzoba: I am not sure we can talk about by positions in the voting. As I understand, we all are representatives. We do not act on our own so in our case, I (unintelligible) the information from the constituency without adding something on the top. So I'm not sure we need that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That is a good point because I'd have to go back to the BC too and say that our candidate didn't move forward and what do I do. And Lori?

Lori Schulman: Do you think the IPC is the only no in this? If we're the only no, I can probably get us to move because we certainly don't want to hold (unintelligible). This is an important issue but I think there are other battles to fight so to speak. I just want (unintelligible) our concerns were raised and in the records. But that being said, if we're the only no I'm pretty sure we could move off the position from Paul, but I would ask in the chat, where does Osvaldo -- when you look at the rankings -- when you look at this numerically, this chart, it's very clear that Julf and Osvaldo are quite close and Paul is really behind all of them.

So just from a pure numeric standpoint, we could knock Paul out and it would be fair. I don't want to say that it wouldn't. It would. But then when you look at how close it is with Osvaldo and Julf, is that a different discussion we need to have? Although Julf's margins are still statistically, they're deciles ahead of Osvaldo it looks like.

So we're going to do a quantitative analysis of it then Julf won and these thoughts and sentiments about the pool and how we move forward on particular positions in terms of what wouldn't be considered good experience, maybe we'd have that debate today and move on. I'm just trying to gauge if

people are wedded to Julf or is there still a discussion on maybe Osvaldo? It sounds like Paul is off the table.

And as I said, we want to cooperate but we also want to make sure that our sentiments are heard.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I think a discussion and seeing the results that Julf came out as the clear, in my opinion, ranked first also and it was pretty clear. But I always think it's good to have a discussion because we're all here so we should be talking about things.

I don't know that there is enough support for people to change to Osvaldo but I'd be open to hearing thoughts on that. So Maxim, it looks like you're up.

Maxim Alzoba: Actually, I think we really do need those two votes to be done because to make proper analysis, we need the whole set of data and it would be -- the best way is to receive the voting. But if they do not vote in few days I suggest we reach constituencies and ask their opinion because without it, we will miss the deadline is my thinking.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Well, there is a concern that their voting would be influenced by the ranking that's already been out to everyone. So let's think about that. Frederic, you have your hand up.

Frederic Guillemaut: Yes, I just wanted to ask, we are trying to reach a consensus or to choose someone and so just asking Lori if she really opposes Julf, or if she just wants to have Osvaldo. I'm trying to figure that out because if Julf is the not welcome candidate, it's not a strong word, I'm not saying a bad thing, I'm French. But what is your (unintelligible) candidate that the IPC doesn't really want or it's because they want Osvaldo, which is effectively close to Julf. I just don't really understand.

Lori Schulman: Right, can I answer that?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure, let's go ahead.

Lori Schulman: As I said, it's not a personal thing about Julf as much as the feedback that the leadership gave me and that included our councilors. Our leadership is comprised of our officers and councilors that temperamentally speaking, that the preference was Osvaldo or Paul over Julf. That being said there was no clear not Julf. That's a bit harsh but we understand the importance of the position as well and given that, we definitely wanted our views known.

That being said, if we're the sole holdout, we can reconsider and I can definitely shift our support toward Julf. If there's movement (unintelligible) holdout, this is not the place where we want to delay or create more controversy than necessary. We are willing to change our vote. So I guess I'm trying to figure out if we voted yes today, are we done? Is that the question that I need to ask? Or...

Susan Kawaguchi: I would assume Tony might have something to say about that and Marika just put her hand up. So well, let's hear from Tony and then we'll go to Marika.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. It's Tony for the record. I'd be more concerned about opening the poll up now because I think if you do it now, when we've almost concluded that the way things stand at the moment, Paul isn't going to be in the fold, then basically it comes down to two candidates that they'll be looking at. And I should preface that with saying from my own perspective, I would be very, very pleased to see Osvaldo elected. But at the same time, I think whatever happens, it has to be fair and I would always argue against allowing a poll to continue after the date and those that didn't vote to come back in because you've got a difficult situation.

Because if that's the case then it wouldn't be long before people didn't vote in the first round of a poll anyway because they wanted to see the way the vote

was going, knowing that they could make a big difference afterwards. So I think that's a very, very bad precedent to set. And just on principle, I think we should steer away from that. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's really good advice, Tony. It really is. We always want full representation if we can get it but we also -- there's only so much you can do to get -- things happen, people get busy and we didn't get their input on this one. Marika?

Marika Konings: I just wanted to share per Lori's question what would happen next, does the decision need to be taken today. What we've basically done for previous calls, if there would be at least a consensus from those on the call that would then be put out on the list to make sure that those that weren't on the call had an opportunity to chime in or object.

As you know, this groups operates on full consensus so if there are any objections, it's something that needs to be taken back from the SEC. So the question is, and I guess particularly to Lori as she has already indicated that she is willing to take it back, whether the group feels that you can put out based on the call and the views expressed that there is a preference to nominate Julf for the position, but indicate that you're asking people to provide feedback, especially those that weren't on the call and those that expressed some concerns on the call or expressed a different preference on the call to then see on the mailing list whether that indeed triggers the two people that didn't participate in the poll to express whether that does not align with what they had in mind or what they would have selected if they would have filled out the poll, and at the same time give Lori then as well an opportunity to consult with the IPC and come back to indicate whether it is something that the IPC could live with or whether it's not, and in which case then I guess we would need to reconvene as a group and discuss what a potential path forward would be.

Lori Schulman: This is Lori. I'm corresponding right now with my leadership. They are at the ready because we did have a strong opinion about this, but we don't have a cemented opinion I guess you would say. If you can bear with me for maybe two more minutes, it's possible that we will shift support to Julf.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So that leaves the question was there anybody else that did not support going with the ranking that the poll shows as Julf as the number one candidate. Tony, you still have your hand up so I'm hoping that's a new hand and you have some words of wisdom for us.

Tony Holmes: Sorry.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So while we wait for Lori to hear back from the IPC, is there anyone else on the line that would oppose nominating Julf as the candidate? Marika has her hand up.

Marika Konings: Definitely not stating opinion on that question but maybe just to fill some time as Lori is consulting with our colleagues, just to note as well that this is another decision that will require a motion to be made and put forward to the council. So in the interim, while you discuss and deliberate, staff can maybe already and put together a draft motion like we've done on previous occasions and share that for your review. And of course, as soon as you make your determination, the name can be filled out.

And again, if for some reason, more time is needed, there if of course still the option as well to submit that motion, leaving a name blank and then as soon as agreement is reached, fill out the name.

Lori Schulman: Can you remind me who didn't fill out the poll? It was Carlos (unintelligible).

Susan Kawaguchi: Poncelet.

Lori Schulman: Just bear with me.

Susan Kawaguchi: You're fine. So Marika, we do need a motion so if you could provide a draft motion for us that would be great and we can all take a look at that. And I'm just wondering if anybody else opposed to Julf as the top ranked candidate? It looks like maybe Lori, the IPC is the only holdout.

Lori Schulman: Right, and I know that our position is not to hold up the whole group if there's no support for our candidate. That's not what we're here -- we're not dying on that sword so to speak. So I just need to confirm that I can switch the vote.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And in the past -- and Marika just said this a little bit ago, when we have not had the full committee on the phone or on the call that what we've done is said that we've decided, we've come to terms with this. The consensus of everyone on the call was the top ranked candidate and we're going to move forward with that, but we also give a couple of days to object if someone has a serious objection.

It looks like Maxim is saying, as I understand it, it's the position of a well experienced manager who can speak both GNSO and GAC languages to ensure translation.

Lori Schulman: Right, and I think that the IPC's doubt about Julf, to be honest. We would feel more comfortable with Osvaldo or Paul in that position. That's where we're standing from on that one. And Paul is a well experienced manager, not necessarily between GNSO and GAC, but between other entities and bodies. I'm sorry, Lori Schulman for the record. Sorry, Nathalie.

Susan Kawaguchi: Tony Holmes has also asked that we should also express the view that we are thankful to have three very good candidates. Can we include that recognition in the motion. We should be able to do that, shouldn't we, Marika?

Marika Konings: Sorry, Susan. What was the question?

Susan Kawaguchi: Tony in the chat has asked if we could include the recognition in the motion that we had -- we were very thankful to have three very good candidates.

Marika Konings: Yes, definitely.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Lori Schulman: Hold on, I think I have the authority to switch our vote. Lori Schulman for the record. Okay. Yes. So the IPC is in a position now to support the rankings and does not object to Julf. And we are -- and I'm typing this into the notes as well -- we are very pleased that our concerns are noted and will be considered for future positions.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And this is Susan for the record. So it looks like we do have consensus now and I appreciate that, and Lori, thanks to the IPC for all that it was a good discussion and I think discussions and allowing everyone to voice their opinion is extremely crucial in our work. So I appreciate everybody bearing with us and working at this. Because truthfully, we do have three really good candidates. So it's a hard decision. So Marika, we're going to move forward with Julf as the candidate but we will ask those that could not make the call today, Renata and Rafik, and I guess Carlos and Poncelet if they have an objection. But otherwise, we have a full consensus here.

So Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just one last question. What would be a reasonable deadline to give to those that weren't on the call to respond? I don't know if it's reasonable until Monday, Tuesday?

Susan Kawaguchi: I would say Monday because we have had this out there for quite a while and I think that if we give them until Monday to respond. Yes, Monday, 23:59 U.S. Time. How's that? Being very specific. We could do that. So we will hopefully get that full consensus on Monday. We do want to allow everyone to have a voice and then we will see a draft of the motion soon, Marika. When would we see that?

Marika Konings: I should be able to get that to you early next week at the latest.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, perfect. And then everybody can make sure that it is worded in the way that they're comfortable and make sure that, at Tony's suggestion, that we add the words of thanks for the great candidates. So I think that's all and we're two minutes away from the end of the hour. So what we do have on our plate to still work on is the review of the charter and to include any -- update any to the processes.

So I think we've learned a few more things from this call and I've made some notes. And also at the end of the poll, several people made notes and I thought there was some good -- I won't read them because everybody else can read them -- but I think there's some things we need to include and some learnings out of this too for our processes. All right, any last comments, questions?

Okay, so Lori, we can consider that. I think we should talk to the candidates. So let's brainstorm on that when review the charter because we could add that to the -- we could add other things to our process so that's a good point to make. So several people are typing. So we should make a list and sort of assess which positions would merit from interviews.

All right, good ideas. A lot of good thinking tonight. Okay, we should add that to the charter. Well, time's up but I thank you all again for all the hard work on this and appreciate you taking the time. All right, thanks all. Have a good evening, or day, or whatever it is, what time zone you're in. Bye.

Maxim Alzoba: Good night.

Lori Schulman: Okay, I have another call. Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you everyone for joining. This concludes today's call. You may now disconnect your lines. Have a great remainder of your day. Goodbye.

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