

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Monday, 15 May 2017 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Standing Selection Committee Meeting on the Monday, 15 May 2017 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/uQ-fAw>

Audio may be found at: <file://localhost/https://audio.icann.org/gnsso:gnsso-ssc-15may17-en.mp3> AND

<https://participate.icann.org/p891o5tzgib/>

Attendees:

Frederic Guilemaut
Maxim Alzoba
Julf Helsingius
Poncelet Illelji
Osvaldo Novoa
Renate Ribeira Aquino

Apologies:

Lori Schulman

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Emily Barabas
Michelle DeSmyter

Michelle DeSmyter: Perfect, all right. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening.

And welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Monday the 15th of May, 2017. On the call today we do have Julf Helsingius, Maxim

Alzoba, Osvaldo Novoa, Poncelet Ileleji, Susan Kawaguchi. We have no apologies. From staff we have Marika Konings, Emily Barabas, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder to please state your name so it appears clearly on the transcription. Thank you ever so much and over to you Susan..

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, Michelle, that was very helpful. So this is Susan. And there's a little bit of noise going – I'm in a – I'm actually not at home today so I'm in a hotel room. Seems there's a little noise outside so hopefully that's not going to affect the call.

So I think at the first thing we need to do – well let me back up a little bit and say thank you very much for all the hard work all of you did on the RDS Review Team selection. And I can see that there was a lot of hard work and thought put into that and I appreciate the fact that you selected me, which I'm really looking forward to that.

The first thing I think we need to do is confirm the chair. I am more than willing to step forward and chair the committee, I am but if there's others that would like to step forward for that that would be great too. So how would you like to proceed with that? Any ideas?

And I do note from the – Marika please, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. On the note of leadership, and some people already pointed out in the charter there currently isn't a specific provision for how that should be dealt with. It refers back to the Working Group Guidelines which basically indicate it is up to a working group or in this case the standing committee, to decide how you would like the leadership to look. And there's a lot of flexibility in that regard.

Just to note that that was also something that specifically came up in the charter discussion because as some of you may know or may recall, originally the composition of that SSC was slightly different and it also foresaw a role for the GNSO Chair as part of the committee and in that set up that person would have served as the chair, but as they decided to change the composition then there was a conscious decision made by the Council that the SSC should decide itself how it would like to organize itself.

And as you've noted, that can be done through chair, vice chair, vice chairs, cochairs, it's really up to the group to decide how to do that. But I think as Julf also noted, this is a relatively small group so you may also want to consider is it really necessary to have a very heavy kind of leadership structure, although, you know, if I can speak from a staff perspective, having at least a chair and a vice chair or a chair and a cochair is always helpful especially for continuity, especially if someone's absent or on vacation, so there's always someone to step up. So just wanted to share that.

Susan Kawaguchi: I agree. And I do think that, you know, as we go forward some of this work may be lightweight but then I think at other times we will have quite a bit to do. So the responsibility comes and goes. And I do note that several people have agreed that my – that I continue as chair is fine with them, which is I thank you for that support.

And also note that Julf and Maxim both volunteered to be either vice chair or cochairs and we need to decide which term we, you know, describe this as, a cochair or vice chair, I'm not – in my mind there's not a whole lot of difference in those it's just how we decide to – what we decide to call this. And I do, you know, with everybody's workload in the GNSO in general and ICANN, even though this is a smaller group, I'm not opposed to having two vice chairs or cochairs due to, you know, just you just never know what the circumstances are and who gets called away to do something else within the community.

So if there's no opposition to having Julf and Maxim both active vice chairs or cochairs then I am – I think that's actually a good situation to, you know, be entering into here with this committee since we will be moving forward with other review team selections and other ATRT is coming up soon. And we may need, you know, especially with the summer vacation schedule and things we may need that extra backup. So does anybody have any viewpoints they'd like to discuss on the vice chair then?

And it looks like Julf is typing. Okay and Osvaldo he's fine with the two vice chairs. And that's true, Julf, if we all three decided that we needed – our time was needed somewhere else, that would be a problem. So can we just move forward with myself as chair and Julf and Maxim as vice chairs?

And, Marika, is there a formal process we need to follow? I should have asked you that earlier, other than everyone just agreeing on the phone call?

Marika Konings: It probably would be good just to send out a note to the mailing list so those that are not on the call also have an opportunity to either express support or disagreement. But I need to double check, I think it's only actually for PDP working groups where there is a requirement for the Council to also confirm the leadership but I don't think it's in this case applicable, but I'll double check on that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay that sounds good. So let's just move forward today as if this is most likely going to happen. And then we will send it out to the mailing list, as you recommend, and get everyone's input hopefully quickly on this.

So I think we can move on to the next – so today what we need to start talking about is – and thank you for switching the slide – oh, Julf, you have your hand up.

Julf Helsingius: Yes, I was just wondering if it's actually would make sense to get a quick feedback on how the RDS thing went because as you know, we actually

picked more candidates than we were supposed to under the understanding that AC chairs would be able to agree on that. I think that might have an impact on our next round so it would be good to know feedback on where we stand on that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you for reminding me about that. I did ask Marika about that this morning and SOs and ACs have not met yet. They tried to schedule a call for I think last week. And weren't able to get everyone's calendars coordinated. So they're hoping for this week or next week. One of the points that may be in our favor for having more than three, especially for maybe even the whole seven, who knows, is that the ccNSO decided not to provide any candidates for the RDS Review Team so that would leave three seats open.

And we're hoping that you know, James can convince the other SOs and ACs that since this is very – a GNSO-centric review that we, you know, the GNSO should receive those other three seats. So but he is very well informed on the arguments to be made. And well you were on the last GNSO call that, you know, he will do his best so.

Oh okay, so and Marika is noting that they didn't feel they could confirm any nomination without knowing the exact scope of the RDS RT. Marika, does that – if there was – that doesn't leave them an ability to reserve those seats in any and fill them later, does it?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So I'm not exactly sure what the status of the letter of the ccNSO is because they didn't really put a specific ask in it, but to me it almost sounded as well that it was kind of like, look, if you clarify the scope in that case we may be able to confirm nominations, because I don't think they – I'm trying to find the letter but I don't think they explicitly said either that, you know, everyone else should go ahead and they're just not participating. So I think it wasn't – at least to my mind, when I read the letter it wasn't clear.

And I found the letter so I can post the link in the chat so people can review it for themselves and decide what they believe may happen. So I'm guessing it also an issue that will need to be discussed by the chairs whether indeed participation will go ahead without the ccNSO or whether indeed there is a need to have further details on the scope that may result in the ccNSO being able to appoint members, I'm not sure, so the link is there. You can review it. I don't believe there has been any response yet from the ICANN Board to that letter.

But noting as well, like apart from the ccNSO I think there's also the ASO and the SSAC that actually didn't even have people that requested their endorsement. So those slots are of course potentially available as well.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh, interesting, I didn't know on the SSAC and the other one. So I did read that letter, and I guess maybe I was being too hopeful – and I shouldn't say "hopeful" but I do think that the GNSO candidates, we had a great slate of candidates, and I think that having more GNSO members on the review team would be good for the review team as a whole. And so I guess I maybe was too hopeful in the way I was reading that because I just assumed since they weren't providing candidates didn't hit the deadline that maybe that then therefore they just weren't moving forward with any candidates. So that'll be interesting.

Oh okay, until the scope of the review is defined. Thanks for joining, Renata. So I'm not sure we can answer anymore questions about the RDS Review Team at this point but we'll keep you updated as soon as there's anything else.

And I'm not sure, you know, I think in my own personal viewpoint I'm not sure that the Board can really step in and define the scope of the RDS review team, that would be my viewpoint at least that the RDS review team can take some guidance, but they will need to define the scope themselves.

Okay, so onto the empowered community and the GNSO representative for the empowered community and can we scroll – do we have individual scroll? There we go, thank you. So at this point what we need to do is develop some criteria and the process for the selection of the GNSO representative and so I don't, you know, today's meeting does not mean that we have to make a decision about anything but we do need to come up with criteria.

At the GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, I did a little bit of an exchange with James about this role. And he's hoping that there will be time in AOB to discuss this with the Council and to get – start to develop some of the criteria from the Council's point of view, so which we'll need to, you know, let them take the lead on that.

But I think it would be helpful too, if we could also give some thought to what that criteria should be and exactly what our viewpoint as a committee is on, you know, who should be the representative for the empowered community from the GNSO.

And Maxim, please go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Do you hear me? Okay, I hope you hear me.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes we do.

Maxim Alzoba: Actually after reading the – yes, the (unintelligible) what the (unintelligible) I have two questions. Actually three but we will try to keep to two. (Unintelligible) is potentially dealing with the public comments forms. And the question is...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Maxim? Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes.

Susan Kawaguchi: We're having a little bit of difficulty understanding you. Could you maybe if you just were a little bit farther away from your mic and it would be clearer, we're hoping.

Maxim Alzoba: Okay is that (unintelligible)?

Susan Kawaguchi: It's a little better.

Maxim Alzoba: Okay. The question is (unintelligible) the bylaws. The question is five persons enough for that (unintelligible) in situations where (unintelligible) of high importance, we could expect (unintelligible) messages per day is the first question.

The second – yes, the second is – yes.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I am – I think we're all having a hard time hearing – understanding you so (unintelligible) or...

Maxim Alzoba: I adjust my mic, one second.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Maxim Alzoba: Do you hear me better?

Susan Kawaguchi: It's a little better.

Maxim Alzoba: Okay, I will type in.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Maxim Alzoba: I will (unintelligible) and type in. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Sorry about that, sometimes you know, it's – with the conference calls it's hard to hear so he's going to type his questions. And, Maxim, if you would like the operator to dial out to you we could do that also. So while Maxim is typing, does anybody else have any thoughts on the criteria we should be considering for the – for this position? And thank you, Marika, for – please go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to put up of the next slide because before you dive into discussing criteria, it may just be helpful just to spend a little bit of time on, you know, the role of the empowered community administration and more specifically as well the role of the GNSO representative because that may also facilitate a discussion on what the criteria should be for that person.

So, Susan, I don't know if you want to take people through or you would like me to take people through?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, please Marika, if you don't mind, I'm sure you get the nuances of this better than I do so.

Marika Konings: Well I'll give it a go. So I think a you may all be aware that the empowered community came into force after all the work that took place on the transition and is now existing as a nonprofit association that consists of the three ICANN supporting organizations namely the Address Supporting Organization, the Country Code Supporting Organization and the Generic Names Supporting Organization as well as the At Large Advisory Committee and the GAC, the Governmental Advisory Committee, which are each called decisional participants.

So those five decisional participants together they comprise the empowered community. The only role that the empowered community has is to exercise the specific rights and obligations that it has under the ICANN Bylaws, and is very specifically spelled out how it needs to act and what timelines are associated with that as part of the ICANN Bylaws.

So as part of that you have the empowered community administration. And that is basically the administrative bodies through which the decisional participants acts collectively. So each decisional participant is required to designate a representative to the EC administration but it's very important to understand that those individual representatives only act as directed by decisional participants and in accordance with the process that each such decisional participant has spelled out.

So I think it's really important to understand that it's purely an administrative role, this individual is more of a conduit to communicate any decisions that are taken by decisional participants to the empowered community administration. So this is not a role in which there's any kind of negotiation or discussion or where there is leeway for that individual to interpret or define whatever the decisional participants may think.

So as such, and I think I have another slide here, from a GNSO perspective, so as said, the way the GNSO has discussed and decided to take its role in empowered community is through the GNSO Council. So any decisions are expected to be taken through GNSO Council motions, which is the way in which the GNSO Council makes decisions.

Of course, you know, having the input and votes from all its stakeholder groups and constituencies, and some of those decisions that are expected to be taken through the GNSO Council are the receiving and sending of EC notifications required by the bylaws. So again, these are decisions that the GNSO Council would take and where the representative is then expected to communicate that, so it's really a question of forewarning that information.

The person may also be involved in moderating community forums that may be required to be called under the ICANN Bylaws. There's a tallying of decisions of decisional participants related to the exercise of EC powers. And then the community mediation initiated where the Board is alleged to have refused or failed to comply with (unintelligible) decision of the EC under the bylaws designated individuals to represent the EC in the mediation.

And again, I think here in in the designating of individuals those are some of the items that are currently still under discussion but is not unlikely that that is also a process that the SSC would be involved in.

So I think that's in short the role of the individual representing the GNSO. It's intended to be a purely administrative role and function because that's the role of the EC administration and the person is indeed directed to communicate any decisions that are taken by the GNSO Council in relation to any items that are for the decisional participants to consider.

I don't know if there are any questions? I see Maxim has his hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: It's Maxim Alzoba again. Do hear me better this time?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Maxim Alzoba: Okay, I have two questions. The first is about the role in moderating community forums. I not feel that five persons is enough to monitor and moderate community forums in case of like (unintelligible) there. I think (unintelligible) messages daily in (unintelligible). The first question like if five is enough.

And the second question is about the – it's more note than a question about (unintelligible) criteria. One of the roles is going to be the review (unintelligible) it was (unintelligible). And that I suggest that one of the

(unintelligible) is going to be at least basically (unintelligible) of financial participation. Yes, thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, your questions weren't completely clear to me, but I think on the first you were asking about the role of the moderating the community forum. I actually was – I don't understand that role, that part of the responsibility of the task either. So, Marika, you had – you have your hand up, so hopefully you have all the answers.

Marika Konings: I wish I did. This is Marika. But unfortunately I don't. I know that that is one of the items and there's actually a first community forum is scheduled for Johannesburg. I think it's on the specific change to the fundamental bylaws that's being proposed. I think following a Board conversation I think it relates to one of the Board committees that was originally designated to deal with certain items and I think the Board has decided to create a new committee to better be able to deal with any requests that may come under that.

But that requires a change to the bylaws so they're actually having a first forum in Johannesburg. And I think there they actually currently discussing what that should look like. So I think it's not 100% clear how that may work in practice. So I'm happy to have a closer look at the bylaws to see if any specific details are provided there with regards to the role of the representative in that community forum.

But a far as I know I don't think that is greatly detailed yet. And I think that is something that probably Johannesburg will be a bit of a trial where I guess the community will need to decide how that would actually look and what roles and responsibilities the different participants have.

And sorry, I didn't catch the second question so I don't know, Maxim, if you maybe type that in the chat?

Susan Kawaguchi: Well he's...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Well I didn't quite. I didn't want to leave the first question because A, I'm confused and I thought it was a good question. So I guess when I first read this I was thinking monitoring instead of moderating. So unfortunately that's where my brain went was I just thought maybe the community forum – and I also was thinking community forum was more of a, you know, a thread.

So a community forum, just to back up a little bit, is – would be an actual meeting or some sort of – it could be online obviously. But it would be where some sort of meeting brought forth by the empowered community to discuss a new issue? Is that it, a change to bylaws or something? Is that what the forum would – is described as?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm just looking through the bylaws and I think there are several instances in which there is references to the community forum. I think they're different actions for which a community forum may be needed. I think, you know, one of them is indeed in relation to changes of fundamental bylaws but I think also for example, actions such as removal of Board members. I think that's another one.

I mean, here I found a reference, just for example, the approval action community forum which relates to specific approval actions that need to be taken. But here it clearly says the approval action community forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room, and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC administration selects and/or only if the approval action community forum is held during an ICANN public face to face meeting.

So there's basically – there's basically the option of indeed if there's an ICANN meeting to do it then, but it can also be done through teleconference or web-based facilities. And it also states there that – and I think did paste

that in the chat, I'll post it in the chat that the EC administration shall manage and moderate the approval action community forum in a fair and neutral manner. But it doesn't there, for example, specifically state, you know, how that would work.

As said, I'll have a look at – and seeing if in other places there's more detail provided there. But again, I think the idea behind it is or at least reading this is that the EC administration is again the administrative body making that session possible but it's really then for the decisional participants and the broader community to participate in the forum, it's not for the EC administration to – then make any kind of decisions.

That again, goes through the decisional participants. I think this is the community forum is an opportunity for public consultation on certain decisions but as I understand that any input of that will then again need to be considered by the decisional participants who will then inform their representative of how to act in the subsequent steps.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that's really informative. So but there would be – there's five representatives to this, one of which is the GNSO. So all five would act as moderators in this forum, is that what you envision?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think that is something for the EC administration to decide. So...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...and again, I think the Johannesburg meeting will be a bit of a test case to see how they will manage that, you know, part of the challenge will be that I think many of the groups haven't appointed yet their permanent representative so again, it may also be something where all of the representatives will come back to their respective groups to say well, this is

what's being proposed and how to manage that, you know, does anyone have any concerns or comments they want to make about that.

So again, it's one of those areas where it hasn't happened before so it's not yet clear how that will work in practice. And to respond to Renata's question, she's asking if the EC rep will also approve stuff on the community forum without going through the GNSO Council. No, I don't think so unless we're talking, you know, admin, you know, who sits on the main table or who will speak first. I'm guessing those kind of discussions, which are more of an administrative nature is something that will be decided within the EC admin. But anything of a substantial manner...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...will need to come from the decisional participant and for the GNSO that will need to go through the GNSO Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That's good clarification. And then, Maxim has typed his question so I'll just read that out aloud. About – or his statement. About basic understanding of financial operations for candidates into the five, they will need to be able to approve a fundamental bylaw and article amendments and asset sales. To approve asset sales, it's good to be aware of basic ideas and finance.

So I think your point, Maxim, is that we should make that part of the criteria that this representative from the GNSO to the empowered community should have some financial understanding at least basic understanding of finance. So and Maxim, you still have your hand up, was that another question? And you're typing and at least we need to ask. So let's put that on the list of things. And hopefully we can ask these – some of these questions that we come up with in the next GNSO meeting also to get – because James has been participating.

And, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. If I can just respond to Maxim's comment, because I don't think that is correct. Even though it says that the EC administration needs to approve it's because it approves through the decisions of the decisional participants. So the only role that is there for the EC representative is to communicate whatever the GNSO Council decided with regards to approving fundamental bylaws, article amendments and asset sales.

It's not for the representative there to make any kind of determination or assessment or any kind of opinion on what he or she may think about it, but it's a purely – an administrative role that's intended to communicate as a really passing on whatever the GNSO Council has decided on that.

Susan Kawaguchi: And this is Susan for the record. But, wouldn't you feel like if there was a financial discussion of some sort that this representative would have to understand that enough to come back to the GNSO and explain the discussion at least? I mean, this is a two-way street communication process I would think. So, I mean, do you not envision any discussion at all on the – with – between the EC reps for these administrative tasks?

If – for example, if the GNSO's decision was no, we're not going to agree to whatever the issue was, but all for the other ones – reps or the SOs ACs had came in with a vote yes, we want to proceed with whatever the issue was, you know, there has to be some communication back. So are you not envisioning any discussion at all on the – when the EC reps meet?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That is my understanding. My understanding is that it's purely at that point a tallying of decisions. So the admin will make a count...

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...every rep will raise their hands if, you know, their group voted in favor or against, and whatever comes out of that, that's the decision. At least I think as it's envisioned on paper, and as a result of the conversations I think as part of the transition related work, it was purely envisioned as an administrative body.

However, of course, in practice, and especially because we're still in a – I think in a learning phase and it would be really helpful to have James's input, although, you know, from what I've seen I think there has been relatively little communication to this stage or little engagement at an EC admin level to see indeed what he may – or he believes what would be the requirements or what is needed.

But as said, I think from what is the bylaws and the original inception, the idea is that it's purely administrative role, no discussion or substantive discussion happens there, all of that would need to go back to the different – to the decisional participants to consider and further deliberate.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay so that's very good to keep in mind that it's simply I think, you know, just remembering that this is more administrative and not decision making so that – to me that would make it the criteria easier to figure out for this. So and Osvaldo pointed out in the chat that EC representative is just the way of communication between the EC and the GNSO Council.

And another one, a question is do we have any former ambassador for this role? Not sure exactly what you mean by former ambassador. Do you want to clarify that? Okay. He's typing. Liaison. Oh, you mean really an ambassador, I'm sorry, I was – so I you know, in my opinion, that this role would have to come from the Council and James acting as the EC rep right now may be the appropriate level because whoever does, in my opinion, whoever is representing the GNSO Council to the EC must be fully aware of everything and all of the decisions the GNSO Council has made so that they understand all of the background.

So it would make sense to make sure that this role is selected from the GNSO Council and maybe even from the leadership team so we would, you know, maybe that's one of the criteria we need to discuss is that it is someone, you know, either the chair of the GNSO Council or one of the two vice chairs. And so the only concern I have with that is that those three roles are pretty, you know, they are tasked with a lot of responsibility right now so we don't want to overburden them but I do know that, you know, our current leadership team for the GNSO Council is very well versed in everything that we're doing. And sometimes I'm amazed at how well versed they are so.

And Osvaldo was saying that anyone with a, let me see, just trying to read from the chat. A fairly intelligent person with good communication skills would be ideal. That's true, but I do think they have to be extremely immersed in the GNSO Council work. And, Maxim, this is the first time – well the – so Marika, maybe you can confirm that, you know, James has been participating on the – as the GNSO Council EC rep and have they met and done much at this point?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't believe so. I've seen a couple of emails and I think indeed the main communications they've had so far is for example in relation to confirmation of bylaw appointees so the GNSO selected a new person to take one of the GNSO seats. The ALAC confirmed their appointment. And again that's also something that the EC admin just needs to take that decision and pass it on. So again, it's conveying decisions that have been taken by some of the decisional participants.

In addition, I think they started the conversation or at least raised awareness around the fact that – and again it's staff that has put that on the agenda that indeed this community forum is coming up for Johannesburg so they will need to have a conversation around that, how that will actually work in practice.

But as far as I know I haven't seen anything yet concretely either around there on how that would – how they intend that to work and operate and at least from what I've seen I think for many this is indeed a first test case and the assumption is that this is a relatively straightforward action, it is a good test case because of course there are community forums for much more complex issues or much more controversial issues so I think that the hope is by having a test case on a relatively straightforward issue may set the framework then for how it will be dealt with in future scenarios.

And actually what I just put up on the screen, which I think is also linked to this conversation is again it's one of the reasons why James is currently filling that slot and I think if you look at the representatives on there I think for all groups apart from the ccNSO it is actually the chair of the SO or AC that is taking the role whether it's on a permanent or interim basis of the representatives to the EC administration as the way the bylaws are written, it basically specifically refers to the chairs or such other persons as may be designated as being that representative.

So again from the GNSO side, as an interim appointment was needed on a relatively short – on short notice, the Council decided that the chair would be picked for that interim position. But of course there is a need for a permanent – a permanent representative and that's again what the SSC has been tasked with to make a determination.

And again, as you read this language and staff put that forward as well as one of the questions I think there are different ways in which you can read this whether the chair is the default and only if someone else is active then is when someone else comes in place or where that's the other way around that it's anyone can be appointed but unless no one can be found then it's the chair who is the backup.

And again, I think it's something where you may want to discuss how you want to approach that theme. I just note that I think from the ccNSO side,

they're actually the ones that I think have appointed a ccNSO Council member, but that was only after the ccNSO chair indicated that she was not interested or willing to take on this specific role.

And then I think they went for a call for volunteers for ccNSO Council members again, assuming that that was also a conscious decision I'm assuming as well that on the ccNSO side it's the Council also who makes is the conduit for making decisions as a decisional participant. But I think for all the other groups it's currently either the chair of that SO/AC whether you know, either at a interim or a permanent basis.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that's interesting. So there's been several – lots of discussion in the chat. And Osvaldo was saying that, you know, because we don't know the workload of the EC representative I would prefer a person with no position in a Council. Julf suggested a former Council member, so that could be all – we could add all of these to the list of criteria that we're brainstorming about.

And Maxim, you know, you asked if – who's in charge of assessment of the GNSO candidates for the EC seat? Is it just GNSO Council or is it SSC and then GNSO Council? My viewpoint is it's the SSC would work with the GNSO Council to develop the criteria which would be approved by the GNSO Council. So I think it always goes back to the GNSO Council and then once we have candidates then we would – if we have more than one candidate then we would decide on that on the candidates but it will still go back to the GNSO Council.

So yes, exactly so you've – oh, Marika has responded better than I did there. So on the how it would – how it works. So any, you know, I mean, we're just a committee sort of a subcommittee of the GNSO Council, any selection we make for any role I think the GNSO Council has to approve.

Okay so right now we have a couple of ideas that we need somebody that can write well and is also intelligent, which is always a good criteria, and then

probably – somebody very familiar with the GNSO Council may be a former Council member. And my suggestion was that it – that we leave this to the leadership team on the GNSO Council but that doesn't seem to carry, you know, there's some opposition to that because we don't know what the workload is here.

And Maxim is suggesting that we ask for letters of – to inclusion of letters of support, support from GNSO bodies as an additional selection criteria. That's not a – that's probably a good idea especially for this role. I think if we get more input from the SOs and the constituencies – or stakeholders, SGs and the constituencies then that would be helpful. So let me make a note of that.

Any other thoughts? And the NCA, we'll make sure the NCAs count or is there – there's no reason the NCA would not count as a virtual body in this scenario, would there – is there, Marika?

Marika Konings: Sorry, Susan, just getting off mute. What was your question?

Susan Kawaguchi: So we were talking about Maxim's suggestion was to get support from each of the SGs or constituencies on the – or maybe just keep it to SG level, I'm not sure, on the proposed candidates for this role so that we ensure that if this was not a GNSO – a current GNSO Council member that they actually had the backing and support of the SGs that they are affiliated with. And so we don't run into a problem with non-affiliation. But then Julf was asking – was saying as long as the NCA counts as a virtual body. So...

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm wondering if you're already going too far into the weeds, and whether it will be easier to first take it up, you know, back to the higher level. And I noted in the chat as well where you first may need to have a conversation around indeed whether the chair is the default or the backup because I think that will then determine as well what kind of process you need to run and as well what the criteria need to be.

And also I think in light of what the role is, it may be helpful to first talk about indeed so what is actually required from this person so indeed what are the criteria and then I think from then you can then deduct indeed is it important that there is a GNSO affiliation and if so what does that need to look like? Is that indeed someone that, you know, a Council member, has been a Council member, is a member of a stakeholder group or constituency? You know, has been a Nominating Committee appointee in the past to the GNSO?

So again I think you may want to start at the higher level and then may make it easier to actually – because it looks like we're already starting to talk more practicalities, you know, do we need the letter, who can submit a letter on whose behalf? But I think we may first need to get agreement around the bigger concept and that then may make it easier then to fill in the details of how that would work in practice, if I make that suggestion.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so actually this is Susan for the record. So that is a good suggestion that we back up a little bit here and get out of the weeds. So, you know, Marika's question then is in reading of this bylaws section she has up, do you know, is this really a role for the chair? Or, you know, should we allow a backup? And pick someone else. I mean, we could come back with a recommendation to the GNSO Council that this should always be the chair and it is just one of the responsibilities the chair must assume.

And that there would be no other person designated to this, it's always the chair. Or should we come back to the, you know, are you of the viewpoint that, you know, there should be an allowance to, you know, select another person to fill this role? So there's support for the chair by Renata.

And the chair would be an emergency intervention. And then we also have the – okay you've put up some questions here and Marika, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, sorry, just getting off mute. This is Marika. So what may also be helpful, and I think we did list some examples in which cases the representative is

expected to act and the question was raised as well, it's not clear yet what kind of workload that will entail. So what may be helpful as well is if we try to list in a more clear way, you know, what are those occurrences for which the EC admin is expected to act.

Because I think indeed it's not clear at this stage if that is a question of something happening once a month, once every six months, once every year, you know, every week. And I guess, you know, part of you know, in order to run any kind of assessment it's something that would need to be provided to any candidate whether it's the GNSO chair, the vice chairs or, you know, anyone else it would be important to be able to communicate what this role is expected to entail.

So it may be helpful if we from a staff side go back and try to list what are those specific actions and what is the likelihood of those happening, because for example, I think one of the actions that may happen is in relation to the budget, so presumably the likelihood of that happening is, you know, only once a year. And again, the question is, you know, it's basically I think in relation to rejection of the budget. So I guess an estimation or a guesstimate would have to be made how likely is that to happen.

You know, is it very likely, so would it happen every year or is it more something that may happen, you know, once every five years? So again, maybe in that way maybe easier as well to have a conversation around, you know, does it make sense indeed to kind of appoint someone completely separate because it may indeed increase the workload of chair or vice chairs to add this to their already very heavy plate, or whether it's something that is more of an add on because it's not expected to be involved on such a regular basis. I don't know if that is helpful, but it's something we could definitely try to do.

Susan Kawaguchi: I definitely – this is Susan for the record. I definitely feel like that would be helpful. And so it would give us some more understanding of what we're, you

know, recommending to ask from this role and therefore the person who fills it. It looks like we're running out of time here, we've only got a minute left. So we'll need to do a Doodle poll for the next call which we need to get these recommendations to the GNSO Council in the next few weeks so that, you know, I think we have a June 17 deadline for any sort of motion. So it would be good if we gave ourselves several more opportunities to discuss this once we get more information.

We'll also have some feedback from the GNSO Council meeting on Thursday. So can we run a Doodle poll for next – to have a meeting again next week, is that possible, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, we can definitely get that set up.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so I think – I actually, you know, I feel like I've learned something here today. And I appreciate all of your input, Marika, and the staff's in general. I did read all of this but it sort of – in the discussion we've had today it's you know, definitely come up with some different points of view. So I appreciate everyone – so in the – I appreciate everybody's time today and it looks like Poncelet has said we should have a time like we did today so we might want to put that on the list.

And, Marika, is your hand up for another point or...

Marika Konings: Yes, I was just wondering on Poncelet's suggestion, if we could see a quick show of hands whether the same time and day works we could even lock it in now if...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...people like this time slot.

Susan Kawaguchi: Good idea.

Marika Konings: If we could maybe ask people to put a green checkmark if this time slot works for you next week and if not of course we can still do a Doodle poll.

Susan Kawaguchi: Maxim said it's a bad time for him.

Marika Konings: Okay so I know that several people have indicated that, you know, for some a good time but not necessarily next week so I'll just get a Doodle poll going for next week with, you know, this time included but also some other options so hopefully we can find a time that works and day that works for everyone.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that sounds good. And we're over time so we should conclude the call. But I really appreciate all the thoughts that went into this today and we'll wait to see the Doodle poll and we'll talk again next week.

Marika Konings: Thanks, all.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks all.

Maxim Alzoba: bye-bye, everyone.

END