

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
30 March 2017 at 16:00 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/gnsso-ssc-30mar17-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

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

Apologies:

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Julie Hedlund
Emily Barabas
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much (then). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. And welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee meeting on the 30th of March, 2017.

On the call today we have Poncelet Illelji, Frederic Guilemaut, Maxim Alzoba, Johan Helsingius, Osvaldo Nova, Susan Kawaguchi, and Renata Ribeiro. We received no apologies on today's call. From staff we have Marika Konings and Emily Barabas and myself Nathalie Peregrine. We also have Glen de St Gery on the call.

I would like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for purposes of the transcript. Thank you every so much and over to you Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Nathalie and hello everyone. My name is Marika. And it's definitely not my intention to lead or chair this meeting. And that's why we've seen -- on the right side agenda -- item two. Where hopefully you can all agree on who's going to take over leading this group.

But just to get you started you see that staff has collated some of the information, has set up your work state, circulated some background information that is hopefully helpful as you move forward in your work. So that's how we've ended up here. As you see on the list -- and maybe helps once we are a relatively small group -- maybe we can just do a little introduction of everyone. And go around the room so everyone knows who everyone is and where you're coming from.

And knowing that we're still short one appointment by the NCSG -- and I've said -- I've noted that I think (Alaurie) is not on the call at the moment. She may be joining later. But she's at IBC representative in this effort. So as noted, you know, my name is Marika Konings. I'm going to be providing you with staff support for this effort together with my colleague Emily Barabas and Nathalie Peregrine.

So any questions or any assistance you may need, you know, please always feel free to reach out to us or let me - let us know how we can assist you. So maybe we can just go through the Adobe Connect and go from top to bottom and for those of you that are on audio are able to introduce themselves. I first have Frederic. Oh, Frederic is working on his audio. Does he need any...

Poncelet Ileleji: Hi, sorry, sorry.

Marika Konings: Oh, yes, we can hear you. Oh.

Poncelet Ileleji: Good afternoon. Can I speak? Poncelet speaking for the records.

Marika Konings: Sure, go ahead.

Poncelet Ileleji: Okay. Good afternoon and good evening. Everybody I'm Poncelet Ileleji. I'm pleased to (attend here). I chair the policy committee for the not for profit operational constituency. And it's still 4:06 GMT here and I'm very pleased to be representing the NCSG in this forum.

And my whole background has been in (ICT) of development and internet policies. So I look forward to working with other colleagues on the different constituencies. Some of them are - I briefly met at the intersessional in Iceland. Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Thanks Poncelet. So maybe whoever wants to go next can raise their hand? At least in that way we know you're on audio and are not calling on anyone that hasn't managed to connect yet. And Frederic you may see that Nathalie is trying to assist you on how to activate your Adobe Connect audio. Osvaldo go ahead.

Osvaldo Nova: Hello. I am Osvaldo Nova. I am from Uruguay. I'm representing internet service provider constituency. I work in the telecommunication company in Uruguay. And right now I am a member of the non-com or the ISPCP also. So I might not be able to dedicate as much time as I need to this group but I will try to do my best.

Marika Konings: Thanks Osvaldo. Who's next? Julf, go ahead.

Johan Helsingius: Yes, good morning, good evening, whatever. This is Julf Helsingius from Amsterdam. And I'm the non-com representative to the non-contracting parties house. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks Julf. Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: I'm Maxim Alzoba. I'm appointed by registry constituency. I work for the (unintelligible) com. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thank you Maxim. Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi, I'm Susan Kawaguchi and I'm a GNSO councilor for the BC. (Ed Morris) and I worked on this charter with staff to set up this committee. So I'm looking forward to seeing how it works. We sort of did an ad hoc version of this for the last - for the SSRRT candidate selection. So I'm looking forward to seeing how this works.

That said, I'm actually - I've applied as a candidate for the Whois RDS review team. So I will be -- after this -- once we get to the point of actually selecting candidates I'll step out, obviously. And another BC member will step in. But I just wanted to be part of it to see.

One of the things that (Ed) and I thought were critical is that we review how well the process works or doesn't work. And so that we might go back to the GNSO council and say okay, we need to tweak the charter here or there. So it'd be really interesting to hear anybody's input once we get moving with this committee.

Marika Konings: Thanks very much Susan. I think we're still missing Frederic and Renata. I don't know if -- Frederic -- if you've already managed to solve your audio issues? Or if alternatively, you want to introduce yourself in the chat. And Renata I'm not sure are you in a position to speak or you may otherwise want to do the same thing. Renata, go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you. Renata Aquino Ribeiro for the record. Yes, I have been appointed by NCUC. Very happy to join you on this committee. I think someone sorted the audio problem. Or...

Marika Konings: Nathalie can you check where the noise is coming from? Sounds like we have aliens on the line. We'll give Nathalie a minute to try and figure out where this is coming from. And I hope it's not my line. Can you hear me?

Man: Hello?

Marika Konings: Hi, this is Marika. I think we managed to get rid of the aliens?

Frederic Guillemaut: Hello, this is Frederic speaking. I've just managed to talk into a microphone. I hope you can hear me. No you can't hear me?

Woman: I can hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Frederic Guillemaut: Okay.

Marika Konings: Yes, I can hear you.

Frederic Guillemaut: Good, I'm Frederic. I'm from (C'est France). It's a French registrar. And I'm from the registrar constituency and I'm happy to work with you on this standing committee. Nice to meet you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Frederic. I think we've covered everyone that's on the call noting that's - we're still missing one member. And (Alaurie) is not with us today.

And I'm for the moment talking through Adobe Connect so I hope my connection stays (okay) and is not (unintelligible). You'll have to bear with us. And as I noted I put together a couple of items on the agenda for your

consideration. But this is really your meeting, so please feel free to suggest how to go about this discussion or how to go about this meeting.

And one thing I didn't specifically call out here -- but the charter foresees -- that in principle the (SFC) is expected to open - work as a normal working group with open recorded meetings. But as a recognition of certain circumstances the (SASFD) may need to operate on a more confidential matter. Or you may want to have certain conversations potentially that are not recorded. But the charter's clear on that case as well that wherever you do put forward conclusions or recommendations you're expected to provide a rationale so that it's clear for the broader community where your recommendations have come from.

And so that's part of something that you may want to consider at one of your upcoming meetings -- how you want to operate -- as well. I think that goes together with some of the practicalities in relation to the frequency of meetings, duration of meetings, (from one) of the reasons why the agenda is as (unintelligible) is that you have an immediate task ahead of you with a very tight deadline to be able to - for the GNSO council to consider your recommendations in relation to the RDS review team at its meeting on the 20th of April.

I see we already have a couple of hands up so I'll stop here and Poncelet, you're next.

Poncelet Ileleji: I'm sorry. I'm Poncelet speaking for the records. (Also I'm) using my mic. Thank you Marika. I just felt that since we were moving over to agenda - on the proposed agenda two selection of interim chairs.

I just like to make a suggestion -- and see what's my other colleagues say -- that in line with the fact that Susan Kawaguchi co-initiated this program -- she said she will step out when the selection process starts -- I would like to suggest we recommend her as one of the interim chairs if there are going to

be two. Because I feel she has an history and she works on it so that (just is) my feelings. So I would just like to hear what other colleagues will say.
Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Thank you Poncelet. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I had a question on the charter. As I understand the review of each person should be done like without assistance of others. Like we have to do (everything readily) and the information can be shared only after GNSO council approves whatever we come with. Am I right?

Marika Konings: This is Marika -- and I'm sure Susan can chime in if I get this wrong -- but I think -- as it's foreseen in the charter -- and I think it's important to recognize that those are our guidelines. I think what the charter aimed to do is put forward a set of general guidelines that are hopefully applicable to the different selections and nominations this committee may need to do.

But recognizing at the same time that in certain cases there may be modifications or nuances to those principles. I think the important part is that the (SFC) is expected -- for each of those selections at some point -- to be able to kind of define, you know, what is the process that is being used and what is the, you know, the timeline that is needed. Again, I think for this specific one we're probably in a bit of a, you know, relatively short timeframe. Which may not allow you yet to do that to the detail which I think was foreseen in the charter.

But I think that's as well how you should read that specific principle. But as I understood it, it basically says members of the (SFC) should first individually review all the applications and make an assessment for themselves how they believe the different applicants meet the criteria as set out in the call for volunteers. And the (entity) can discuss how that is done.

For example, everyone can, you know, just individually run through the CVs and, you know, mark them up, different grade, you know, pass, non-pass, one to ten. And for example, for the SSR review team we use a survey. So I think we - we've listed the different criteria that were included in the call for volunteers and then asked each individual member to rank the candidates against those criteria.

And again there are different ways in which you can do that. You can kind of, you know, force, you know, a one to ten ranking. Or you can just give people points and you kind of add them up. So there are different ways in which you can do that. The idea is then that once that individual review or assessment has taken place you come together collectively and those collective results are then reviewed and discussed.

And so there may be occasions where there's a very clear agreement on, you know, whoever's the top candidate or the second or the third. But in certain cases there may be a very diverse perspective. And again, it's for you then to discuss how to resolve that and come to full consensus on, you know, who you want to put forward.

Once you've gone through that process and have agreed and have come to full consensus on which candidates you want to nominate -- and as I further pointed out in my email yesterday as well -- again there's some options in there. And GNSO has the ability to nominate up to seven people to this review team. However only three of those have a guaranteed seat.

So again it's up to you to make a determination what you're going to recommend to the GNSO council. Are you just going to recommend, you know, up to three? Are you able to recommend three priority candidates and then four additional ones that may come into the mix if not all the other groups nominate up to their three candidates? If you do that you're - do you want to rank those candidates from four to seven in a preferred order? There's a number of ways in which this can be approached.

And again, it's really up to you to think through it and decide what approach to take. And of course in certain situations it may depend as well on the number of applications and the quality of those applications. Because again, it may also be a question if (there are) four people asking for GNSO endorsement, there's not - you know, there's no benefit to even nominate seven. And once you (unintelligible) that and finalize your recommendation that is when those are submitted to the GNSO council who will vote on those (recommendations).

And once approved they will then be communicated to the other SOs and - SO and A chairs who will make the final selection of the review team members. (Knowing) again that for the first three that are nominated have a guaranteed slot and those cannot be changed or switched out. And Susan I see you have your hand up and I'm hoping I didn't get too much of that wrong.

Susan Kawaguchi: No, it sounded perfect to me Marika. There was just a couple things I wanted to note. You know, we do expect you to consult with your own community, either your (SG) or constituency. And because first any candidates come from your community, you would know the best and would know if they're suited for this or not.

And so your recommendations are extremely important about your own community members that are candidates. But also -- the charter isn't explicit in the fact that we have to - that we should rotate -- but we should always keep that in mind. So I think it, you know, the SSR Review team candidates, you know, that process sort of followed some of what's in the charter. But it was a little ad hoc because of timing and truthfully we could not get all the member together to talk about the candidates at once.

So it - we learned a little bit through that process. But I think in the NCUC -- or NCFG -- did not have a candidate selected last time so we really should be

focusing on ensuring that, you know, in the review team going forward. Where are we sort of looking back? We want to choose the best candidates but also we wanted to, you know, if we can, make sure that all the stakeholder groups are rotated through.

So, you know, as for reviewing we do expect you to (employ) this committee to review all the candidates and come up with their own recommendations. But I found it helpful with the BC because there was time where you were looking at other stakeholder group candidates -- and I didn't know them -- but somebody else in the BC had worked with them and found them very capable and, you know, sort of a person that works well on a working group.

So it - so when someone was advocating for them it was like yes, this is the same perception that somebody else has told me. So that helps to go back to your own community. And then - and just to remember that, you know, we want to make sure that all four stakeholder groups in the GNSO council get a fair share of representation down the way.

The other thing that happened that sort of threw us was one of our top three picks was actually selected by a different SO and AC and nominated for the SSR review team. So we went back then and pulled up our fourth pick to be one of the top three. Which goes to show that we definitely need more than three candidates to recommend.

But also the idea is if other SOs or ACs do not fulfill all three of their slots we potentially could then use maybe our fourth, fifth, or sixth pick to fill those slots. It depends on the agreement of the SOs and ACs when they all meet to determine the review teams. So in this case they decided that 21 might be too big for the SSR team. And didn't - and the other SOs and ACs did not hand over their selection spots to the GNSO. But we're always hopeful so we should always pick seven. In a ranked order.

Marika Konings: Thanks Susan. Renata?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Yes, can you listen to me here? On the phone bridge?

Susan Kamaguchi: Yes, we can hear you.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hello? Yes? Can - I hope (you all were listening). Okay. So, Renata. I - as I was presenting I felt so disappointed by NCUC. And I am also part of a similar project. A new project in (unintelligible) to enhance diversity participation in the groups.

It's very interesting to have - to see this community forming here. And also I would like to thank for the comprehensive materials sent to us. And I would concur with the comments on appointing the alternates as well. So I understand we have three guaranteed seats and we can appoint up to seven. So one of the problems we have right out of the bat here is that we are (few women to five men) in our community is that correct?

So even though we do not have yet the appointed member by NCFG -- the (descendent) -- we are already down on gender balance. I think that will a very common situation in the candidate pool. So I would like that also to be taken into consideration. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Renata. Julf?

Johan Helsingius: Okay, Julf Helsingius for the record. I would just like to clarify something because of my original understanding was this of we would sort of - we select candidates but the GNSO council would actually vote on the candidates. If we only pick the number of candidates that there are positions we -- in a sense -- already commit to (maybe) the council only having either approving or non-approving it.

So I just would like clarification what is our premise here? Are we supposed to sort of come up with a bunch of candidates and the council decides on

them? Or do - should we really decide on which candidates and then basically they just say yes or no?

Marika Konings: Julf, this is Marika. My understanding of the charter is indeed that the expectation of the council is that the SFC will indeed provide recommendation on the candidates in a ranked order. Whether that's three, whether that's seven, you know, whether it's one, or whatever you come up with.

But the GNSO council does have the ability to either change that or go back to the SFC if there are the view that, you know, you've missed something. Maybe you didn't take into account the rotation that Susan was referring to. So there's no obligation for the GNSO council to just accept the recommendation. That is, although the expectation is that indeed the committee does its work in such a way -- and noting as well of course that's, you know, representation from all the groups -- there's still consensus.

My believe is that there is a hope that, you know, whatever you provide is in line with what the council views as well so that they can indeed just approve the work that has been done. But there's no obligation to do so. There is the flexibility for the council to either change your recommendations or refer them back if they believe further work is needed. Or they may have clarifying questions.

Johan Helsingius: Okay, thanks for...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kamaguchi: Yes, I think you covered that, you know, in the last round with SSRT. You know, the council just went ahead and agreed to all seven candidates in that - in a ranked order.

And so you know, but they, you know, if anybody had objected then we could have gone back to look at it again. Or maybe changed you know, somebody from the second ranking to the seventh or switch spots or something. So I think we should be cognizant of that and open to that if the council has concerns with what, you know, the candidates or the ranked order that we've come up with.

Marika Konings: Thanks Susan. Before we continue -- because I know we're already going into the substance of the conversation -- can we maybe first come back to item two? Because I would love for you to take this over. I've - you know, already heard one nomination being made for Susan. Susan we haven't heard yet whether (you're) willing to consider that.

I don't know if there are others that are willing to be considered for this role. The charter foresees that you select amongst your members and how you want to manage this group whether it's a chair, or chairs, or interim chair or whatever structure you think will work best. And of course, you know, staff is (unintelligible) to support whoever is willing to volunteer for that role.

I think Frederic has his had up before. So I don't know if Frederic if you wanted to comment on this specific topic or what I (moved) to Susan first. So then we can close off the item of two and then move into the other areas.

Frederic Guillemaut: No, it was regarding another question. So we can go back to item two.

Marika Konings: Okay. Susan?

Susan Kamaguchi: So I appreciate the vote of confidence but I think it would be a little awkward as me as a candidate to be chair. I also feel like I'm not sure that whoever steps in from the BC to temporarily replace me on this committee.

But maybe co-chairs would be a good idea if - you know, I don't mind doing the work and helping chair the committee. I'm - since I'm pretty familiar with

the process -- but as a candidate I don't feel like I can do that. So if we pick co-chairs then I could step back in after the RDS review team candidates have been selected.

Because then we have the ATRT -- is that it Marika? We have another one after this, right? Shortly?

Marika Konings: Well it's actually the GNSO representative to the designated empowered community.

Susan Kamaguchi: Oh, empowered - okay.

Marika Konings: It's the other one that's immediately following this one.

Susan Kamaguchi: Yes, so, I mean we - this committee will have some work to do and I'm hoping to be part of that but, you know, to actually be the only chair I think would be awkward.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Yes, Renata here. May I? I hope you are listening to me okay.

Marika Konings: Yes, go ahead.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: So if - thank you. So yes, I would first remove the parenthesis on interim. Selection of interim chairs indeed because we are still one - waiting for one more nomination. And then we can confirm the chair when we have the full group. Should we be a big change if the chair would already be exercising the chairmanship of the group. Or chairwomanship.

And a question really. Yes, so where will have situations where members of the group will have to recuse themselves because they are running for selection themselves. So we discussed the idea of our co-chairs. Now there's a selection for rotating chairs. I'm wondering about members - the biggest I've seen in ICANN is three co-chairs and we have how many?

Seven - nine of us. So that would be a third being co-chairs. I think that's a good enough number but I would like to hear more on this point, thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Renata. And just to point out that I think -- for some of the groups that have indeed a leadership team of two or three people -- those are usually groups that are over 100 working group members. So I do want to make sure that you think about not creating too heavy a bureaucratic structure.

Although I think from a staff (unintelligible), perhaps it's always definitely helpful to have at least two, so in case or someone is not available. Or, you know, if there's, you know, they may need to recuse themselves there's always someone else able to step in. And Frederic is it still on the other point or on this point?

Frederic Guillemaut: No, this time it's on this point. So I think we are not a lot of people in the group as you said. And maybe chairs, co-chairs is a bit overkill according to me. Because (unintelligible) the - our task is just to run a project. Make some selections and agree on them.

And I think maybe a coordination role -- like project leader -- would be someone who would just coordinate and I do think we should call it a chair. But that's fine if we want to call it a chair why not. But (unintelligible) this or coordinator because most of the job will be done by ourselves. And then we just have one meeting and try to figure out a consensus on the candidates. And should be - it should - maybe I'm too naive but it should be easy, I guess. No?

Marika Konings: Thanks Frederic. Nothing at ICANN is easy, believe me. Or maybe I'm thinking (less) practical here. But no I think you make a very good point. You know, one of the approaches you can consider -- and as I noted in the chat as well -- there's nothing preventing you from doing so. That indeed you appoint an interim chair or co-chair for this specific selection process and then (veto) that for the next one.

It will also of course alleviate the burden. Because, you know, being a chair or chairman (as of course) come with some additional work and responsibilities. So it may be as well we may get more volunteers if there is a clearer start to that role and responsibility. So that may definitely be something you'll want to consider. Maxim, you had your hand up?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually I think we might need a - either two co-chairs or an alternative chair in case where the major one just cannot be there. Or -- as Susan told us -- that some items shouldn't be peer reviewed when the person actually needs to make some kind of secondary decision about things also. Or (unintelligible).

So I think we will need something like it. It doesn't matter how we call it but as I see co-chairs work fine. If they share (a law) then actually just replace each other in situations where one is not available for some reasons.

Frederic Guillemaut: Thanks

Maxim Alzoba: And just in case we don't find the second one I'm stepping in to be an alternative chair in case where Susan just thinks it's not okay to be in this seat.

Marika Konings: Thanks Maxim. So I think what I've heard is that there is, you know, broad support to have two co-chairs for this effort. In any case -- as I think Renata pointed out as well -- it would be interim at this stage as we're still waiting the appointment of one more person who of course may also be interested.

And I think it was also suggested that maybe it could be indeed for this specific selection only at this stage and then reconsidered for the next one. And I think Susan has already indicated that, you know, following this one she would be interested to take on that role. So I think the question is now -- specifically for this effort -- I think Maxim already indicated his willingness to

come forward. And is there anyone else that would like to take on this role and (they could) lead the call from here onwards? Or I'm happy to run as well for this call and basically the person would start for the next.

And to Renata's question while you think about that question. Yes, correct, the charter foresees that if someone is not able to attend or -- that may also be in the scenario where someone has to recuse themselves -- that it's your responsibility to identify or find an alternate to replace you.

My assumption is here -- but again this of course, you know, between you and the groups that have appointed you -- that that is something you may want to communicate with your respective groups. As, you know, you're principally the appointment. And they may want to be aware if -- for some reason -- you're not able to participate or you have to recuse yourself.

So I don't know if there's in any case then they may want to take a role in appointing their replacement or whether it's something you as an individual are able to do. But again I think that's something for you and your respective appointing organizations to figure out.

So I'm not seeing any hands at this stage. And are you happy with me to continue for this meeting? And then it's also a question we put out on the list so that hopefully for the next meeting we'll have at least two volunteers? I'm not seeing any comments or responses. I don't know if to interpret that as okay. All right, let's see if (a yes is an okay). All right.

So I think I'm - knows we'll move ahead to the next item on the agenda. And I think we reconnect - oh, is someone trying to speak? Okay. And I think we can probably take the next two items together. I think to a large extent we already started discussing those. I'll just pull up the slides that I shared and hopefully all of you - actually Nathalie can I ask for your assistance in changing the document? Because for some reason Adobe Connect doesn't let me.

So we shared with you some slides that were hopefully shared with our colleagues that are actually supporting - or that will be supporting the RDS review team. And that have worked on the call for volunteers and managing that information. That is currently available. That provides a quick overview of what the RDS review team is actually about, how the selection process has run to date, as well as what the expectation is with regards to this selection.

So I think - and I have to admit I don't know if this is basically based off - I think when they presented this information in - at ICANN 58. So this may have changed slightly. I think this is the most important part and I think we've already discussed it briefly. But they can be - each supporting organization and advisory committee is expected to nominate a slate of candidates from the applicant pool.

And the expectation is that you review those candidates that have indicated that they want to be endorsed by the GNSO. And I said before the top three of those get an automatic seat. For the four additional ones -- a potential for additional ones -- those are potential alternatives that the SO and AC chairs can consider as they select representatives. And noting that they're expected to factor in the (absentees), the diversity, and gender and geographic in that overall slate of candidates.

There's no obligation to fill up the whole review team to that maximum number of 21 people but it's a possibility. And again, for the SO and AC (leaders) to decide. Following that the selected review team members are announced. And others can observe the work. The hope or the expectation is that the review team can have its first meeting after Copenhagen and before the Johannesburg meeting. But of course that is dependent on the work by the different communities to endorse their candidates or provide that nomination.

I think from what I've seen so far I think the GAC has already confirmed their nomination. But I'm not sure if any of the other groups have already done so. Noting that there are a couple of communities that have not identified or no one applied for those specific groups. Which will make it relatively likely that there will be additional slots available to be filled should the SO and AC chairs decide that that is helpful to ensure the overall expertise and diversity of the group.

And so I think I briefly already covered this. So this is basically the overall selection process up to maximum 21. The board also designates a liaison and that person has already been identified. And as I said before, you know, SO, ACs nominate up to three members each and have them seated. And then any nominations beyond that number of three could be appointed, but that's a SO AC chair conversation.

So what I did here in this slide is to briefly pull out some of the elements of the charter that may be relevant to be considered for this conversation. So at (unintelligible) you're expected to provide the GNSO council with a recommendation of who to nominate, factoring in that the GNSO can nominate up to seven with three guaranteed seats.

And you're expected to evaluate candidates individually and then collectively and decide how to select the different people. And then you will -- based on that review -- rank the candidates according to the criteria listed in the call for applications. And, you know, as noted you're expected to strive as far as possible to achieve balance representative of diversity and sufficient expertise appropriate for the (applicant) selection process.

Following that you're expected to communicate this to the GNSO council including the proposed ranking. And you're expected to make your recommendations by full consensus. And full consensus basically means where no one in the group speaks against the recommendations in its last

reading. So in a fact it means everyone has a veto in this context. So I think that's in short the RDS review team and the selection process.

What I'll pull up now -- if I don't know if it lets me -- is the other documents that I shared with you which is basically that aims to bring together the different aspects of this discussion. So in this document you first of all see some of the things I just mentioned that are in the charter. Then it covers the responsibilities, skills, and expertise, other desired attributes as they were called out in the call for volunteers.

So those are the different criteria that volunteers are expected to meet in order to serve on the review team. And then we have a table that provides an overview of the candidates that have applied for this review team that have identified as seeking endorsement from the GNSO. I already went into the different applications and tried to (sort) their stakeholder group and constituency affiliation.

It's one of the requirements -- as well in the charter for SFC -- that basically indicates that there's the expectation that -- and Susan already referred to that beforehand as well -- that those that identify that they're part of a certain group that you're able to confirm that indeed they are member known. And as such should be considered a candidate from that specific community. Except for several of these, you know, I know that they're active in certain groups (unintelligible) who from our perspective or from a staff perspective we know they are active and participating in this group.

However, for a couple of those we either were not able to identify that from their application or they mentioned a number of groups. So we may need to look for confirmation from the different reps on this group to make sure that, you know, we identify whether it's indeed. Because some time for one applicants named in their application both NCUC and (unintelligible) and (CSG) there may be a desire to pin down which group that exact (are in).

Renata, I see in the queue. I'm almost done. Then there's as well a column that talks about the staff assessment of expertise criteria. That is a separate document that you'll find posted on the wiki page and which again, it's not (full) staff that has done that. But the staff that has received the applications and is responsible for the overall process. But basically has gone through all those applications and -- from their perspective -- kind of flagged where the candidates meet some, meet most, or meet all criteria from their perspective.

Again this is just a piece of information that you may find helpful as you review these candidates. It's definitely not intended to limit your discussion or consideration of these applicants. And then there's also one column that basically identifies whether any of these applicants are currently active any Whois related groups or who have been active in previous review teams.

And again what I've done for here for those that identify that they were - they are or were active in the RDSPDP working group -- I've added the percentage of attendance in those groups so you also have an idea of active - how active their participation. So from a staff perspective we hope that this provides you with an initial set of information. And to basically decide how to move then to the next step to evaluate these candidates first individually and then collectively to be able to come to agreement on which candidates to nominate.

And as I've mentioned before -- and I think also mentioned in my email -- the timeline for that is fairly short. As the document deadline for the upcoming council meeting is the 10th of April. So ideally you will have your selection and recommendations ready by that date for the council consider it during its meeting on the 20th of April. So that's it. Renata, sorry for keeping you waiting.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you, Marika. Renata. I hope you can listen to me okay. It's not (indicate on the charts). I am just wondering -- I did see here (unintelligible) GAC has confirmed their nomination and I did see that this

was a staff assessment (unintelligible) of the graduates in attendance. And so there were other aspect.

I am wondering if there's any discarded applications? And if we can already - like right out of this list I see someone who is affiliated with GAC. So would that be someone we would not consider in our discussion or not? I'm just asking to make this clearer. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Renata. It's a very good question. I think there as well we probably will look to you to lead confirm. Because like I said I looked at the application of the person and the only reference in the application I could find was to GAC participation. But that (may not include) that this person is a member of one of the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituency.

So indeed the hope is that as you review this list, you communicate back to the SFC while their people have been correctly labeled as either being part of your respective group or they haven't been labeled and should be labeled as such. But indeed then you're correct. Once you've confirmed the affiliation it's up to the SFC to decide if you believe any nominations coming out of this group should at a minimum be affiliated with the GNSO stakeholder group or constituency.

That would allow you indeed then to eliminate some people from the list. But that's probably a question that you will need to discuss as a group. Is that a criteria you want to set, you know, at the outset? There needs to be a stakeholder group constituency affiliation or not. (Also) your question? If you still have your hand up or is that an old hand? Go ahead. Julf, can you hear me?

Johan Helsingius: Yes.

Marika Konings: Go ahead.

Johan Helsingius: Yes, this is Julf. I just couldn't hear you actually giving me the (unintelligible) it calls. Somehow it cut out just at that point. Yes, I have a question about the sheet especially with the candidates where it says this is the assessment of the expertise criteria. I'm very (unintelligible) about where this meets some or all. This way we could get sort of one level deeper than that.

Marika Konings: Everyone can you hear me now? I think I'm back on audio, so...

Susan Kamaguchi: Yes, I can hear you Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay. Julf I don't know if you already made your contribution. I was having some audio issues. So I didn't hear if you had any specific question. If, I mean, you know, whether your comment has already been noted.

Johan Helsingius: Yes, sorry. Let me then try to repeat because it was in during that problem hearing. I was wondering if we could actually get one level deeper information than just meets or most or some. Some sort of which specific ones does it meet, doesn't it meet?

Marika Konings: Thanks. Thank you. Again, I think it's really up to the SFC to determine how deep or how far you want to go with that. Staff made this initial analysis and it's for up to you to decide, you know, what you want to do with that. Or whether indeed you want to review to see whether you agree with the assessment that was made or whether there's a different approach you want to take.

Johan Helsingius: Okay, but so if (unintelligible) staff has already made that evaluation. I was just wondering if we could get that data that the staff looked at. So what specific ones did they think didn't meet, and so on.

Marika Konings: Ah, okay, I understand your question. So basically if you look -- and I'll post the link in the chat shortly -- the full document is on the wiki page. That

basically provides this evaluation for all applicants, not only the GNSO ones of course. But I think basically they've made the assessment for all.

But and -- I don't know how to say this diplomatically but -- my guess is well that they kind of there is no didn't meet the criteria. The kind of lowest ranking is meets some. So gain I don't know if that's in certain cases trying to be nice or whether in certain cases it does mean that maybe they met some because they filled in the application but they actually didn't meet any of the criteria that were outlined.

So I think that is something where you may need to dive in deeper to really understand is the meeting some meaning that indeed there's some criteria they met but others they didn't? Or they actually met very few of the ones that were outlined. Does that answer your question?

Johan Helsingius: Yes, thanks.

Marika Konings: Frederic?

Frederic Guillemaut: Yes, I'm just wondering. We have this list of - well we have the whole list of all the people from all the SOs and we have the list on the wiki with like 15 people. And they are really the people we have to select our candidates from, is that right?

Marika Konings: That's right.

Frederic Guillemaut: The application received (unintelligible) so that makes things easier. But there is one criteria that I'm not very - that I don't really understand it. The -- well I do understand it but I don't know how to deal with it -- is the geographical diversities. Does this mean that if we have like three good candidates from any part of the world we have to remove one to add one from another part of the world? Or how do the other teams do?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. My understanding is that the ultimate responsibility for that is actually with the SO and AC chairs. And obviously I, you know, presume there is a desire or an objective for, you know, for the selection committee and as well as the GNSO council to factor that in as they review candidates.

But as I understand it the ultimate responsibility for that is when the selection is made. Because of course then there is the ability to balance things out. Because I think we, you know, to be realistic as well, there may be a situation where all applicants for one SO or AC are all from one geographic region, one gender, you know, one specific group. Then you don't really have the ability within that selection to balance it out. But again when the SO AC chairs review that broader picture they have some flexibility there. Especially if there, of course, and places free to balance it out by looking at other candidates that may have been nominated.

I'm conscious that we're running out of time as I think we only scheduled this call for 60 minutes. I don't know if there's any flexibility for any you to continue a bit longer or whether we should briefly talk about next steps? Maybe you can - if you can continue for a bit more maybe you can put a green check mark? Okay, I see a number of you indicated that you have - okay. Five minutes, ten minutes max. Okay.

So I think we probably need to start moving towards then a discussion on what to do next. How can we go from here to our next conversation during which you'll have had a chance to review the applications, potentially even already you know, select from your perspective and then go into a collective conversation?

And you know, I think it's as I noted -- and Susan did as well -- on, you know, for the previous one we used a survey approach to have a first assessment and then the subsequent conversation. If that's something that people are willing to consider? Are there any other approaches that you think will help

us get to an agreement on the seven nominations? (As said) noting that we're in a pretty tight time - tight timeline.

Which also brings me to the next point is when we should be scheduling a next meeting or whether you think we'll be able to provide a lot of information in the - on the meeting? I see Renata asking a question on the general column on the briefing. I'm not sure - is - was the general column included somewhere else or that's something we would need to add? Just trying to get clarification on that.

And of course in that case we would need to see if that is a question that's being asked. Now actually looking at the staff assessment it is included in there so we can easily add that. It shouldn't be a problem. Maxim, I see you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. As I understand the applications they have list of qualifications desired for the person who like is trying to be a part of the team. So I suggest we have something of this role with persons and qualifications and rankings. Because without it, it just - I'd say in the weighted approach -- when it says to some degree fully or not at all -- the composition of the value or how you choose, (unintelligible) is important.

We don't see the poll (unintelligible) so I think we will need to go with rankings and things like that. Because if we choose like persons, we might miss qualifications. So we (I support) the formal approach like qualifications and rankings. Between zero, has zero knowledge of DNS and 10 is the uber god of the DNS. And then we go to the (persons). That's it. And yes.

Marika Konings: Thanks Maxim. And so one question -- and it's definitely something staff is able to set up -- is that we've done it for the previous one as well. But what we didn't realize as part of that effort was that of course there's some nuances to it. And I refer to it before because indeed (unintelligible) if you look at the -- I think it's page two -- which of those responsibilities, skills, and

expertise provide attributes do you want to rank on or all of those or do you want to do it collectively?

Then the other question is when you rank or score do you want to have a kind of forced ranking? So basically we'll list all the candidates and you're basically asked to rank these from one to -- I think there are 11 - no I think there are 14 people on this list -- so one to 14. And that of course gives them that kind of forced score at the end based on the aggregate of everyone's input. Which is one way of doing it.

Or you kind of have the ability to give each candidate, you know, up to 10 points. That means that several can score eight or nine and you don't exclude it. So but there are several ways of doing it so it would be helpful if you can provide us with some input how you would like us to do that. We can then create the poll and send you a preview.

And based on your feedback then -- and hopefully we can do it in a relatively short timeframe -- we're then able to launch the poll and have some results for you then to review and can discuss. And Susan, I see your hand is up.

Susan Kamaguchi: Yes, I think we should -- and in the interest of time we're probably have to take this to the list but -- I think we should decide on the criteria in the survey. The survey was really -- or, well, no it was the survey -- we went through and answered questions per candidate. Each of us individually. And it really did help guide our thinking and the staff had set that up for us.

So I think we should quickly -- and not on today's call probably but you know, in the next 48 hours if possible -- figure out what questions we all want to consider for each candidate. And as we did that it became really apparent -- as we went through the survey individually for the SSR team -- it became very apparent where the stronger candidates were lining up.

And then when we came to our - to the meeting to discuss those candidates we already had taken the time to review them individually. So, you know, I sort of dialed into the meeting with five key candidates in mind. I mean maybe we should say seven because we could place seven. And - but not all of those candidates that I had recommended ended up, you know, being selected after, you know, the four or five of us discussed them and voted on them when we came to a full consensus.

So I do think the survey's helpful but we would need to get the criteria for that survey to staff really quickly.

Marika Konings: Thanks Susan. And you know, if it's helpful we can put together a first draft and maybe just use what is currently in there from the call for volunteers. And that maybe make it easier as well for you then to refine that. Or maybe at least gives you something to look at.

And then we can as well - if that's, you know, maybe lead - approach this first with the forced ranking. So you have to choose, you know, one through to 14 and see if that is something that, you know, meets what you think what the SFC needs or whether we need to tweak that or modify it.

And as you know that unfortunately we have a fairly short timeline to do this, which makes this a little bit more hurried than we would of course normally have - we normally do. And be able to probably think more through how the different approaches would work. But now we may need to do it more in trial or error approach. Renata?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Renata, thank you Marika. Yes, I agree that it would be very helpful that having a draft. I would also like to think that most of the (calls) have similar criteria. So I am thinking if we can have something like a permanent rubric that gets adapted every time we have a selection. So also we can in time suggest improvements in this probably standard rubric. And the specific rubric criterias for each selection. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Renata. I think that's a very helpful suggestion. And I think as well that the desire -- as this is a standing committee that doesn't need to reinvent the wheel at every selection process -- so I think that indeed the more than can be created that is replicable for other selections or future selections the less work it will of course be for everyone involved. So I think that basically gets us out of time. And Maxim? You be brief? Because I know several people have to drop.

Maxim Alzoba: Briefly, just small notice. Yes, small notice. I don't think the permanent case directory is a good idea because for different things we might need to see different persons with different qualifications. And it's like ever-growing matrix of skills and you need to update it. So I don't think it's going to work. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks Maxim. And I think it's definitely something that (the group can) of course evaluate as you go to your next selection of course. And this case the next selection is very different and is not a review team. But the more review teams are down the line. So again I think it's for you to enter review. What is useful and what can be replicated.

And so briefly then we need to schedule probably our next meeting. And so from a staff side we'll try to get the survey out. Hopefully then in the next couple of days we're able to refine the survey and get it into a state that you can all fill it out. And so that does mean that we need a few days to pull that all together.

I see that Poncelet has suggested a next call on the third of April but that's probably too short notice to, you know, get a survey in a place where everyone is able to review it. So should we currently aim for next week same time same date? And hoping that we can make significant progress on the list? Or do people believe that is too late?

Susan Kamaguchi: I would think Wednesday would better than Thursday.

Marika Konings: Okay, so maybe...

Susan Kamaguchi: Gives us a couple of days to...

Marika Konings: ...yes, that sounds very reasonable. So maybe Nathalie can you circulate a (unintelligible) poll to find a time? And next Wednesday - and maybe do Wednesday and Thursday because if we are not able to make sufficient progress on Wednesday or Thursday.

And I think we actually we may need to already add a day as a call time as well for the Monday the 10th. That would at least allow us then as a backup because (time is crucial). Our deadline to provide a nominations or recommendations to the council so that at least gives us then a backup time to do that.

So if that works for everyone we're going to do a poll out and with the aim of at least having a meeting on Wednesday, potentially also one on Thursday. And then a backup on the Monday to be able to finalize any one that may still be outstanding. All right, yes. And then Maxim I don't - I think we're just looking for next week.

We haven't started a conversation yet on what comes beyond that. I think we're first trying to figure this one out and I think then we'll probably can take a little breath and figure out what the timing and sequence should be for the next assignment. Which is the - a permanent - or the representative on the empowered community for the GNSO. All right.

Well thank you very much for all for joining and for indulging us for 12 more minutes. And speak to you all soon and see you hopefully active on the (unintelligible). Thank you very much.

Woman: Thanks all.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's call. You may now stop the recordings.

END