

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
GNSO Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) Executive Committee Meeting
Saturday, 11 March 2017 at 1:45 CET**

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 recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Tapani Tarvainen: Come up front. Whichever side you want to be on. So this is the Executive Committee meeting of Non Commercial Stakeholder Group and this is Tapani Tarvainen speaking. We have a fairly short agenda. But there is – actually there was supposed to be one more item we can get that until late – it's on the agenda the fourth agenda item we had was the forthcoming election procedures. Trying to start that process in time for once.

For member applications, the plan was to try the brand new member database, which is fancy, pretty interface but there is some last minute glitch so that the one part is not working is the EC member interface so which was pretty and so we can't use that but we can still go through the applications.

As a quick review, the intern that we really have a – one week now no new applications have been going to this new database, the database seems to be working, I can work them on the administrative interface but the Board member – EC member interface, which would be easy to use and show it doesn't work.

And I'm not sure if it's actually – okay, Maryam, can you display that (CDCRM) screen you have? If not, we can just go through them by that – email list I sent earlier where we have the applicants shown. Maryam?

Okay, you might want to throw this in full screen or look at that one. This is separate, not pretty screen, has lots of unnecessary things and applications appear twice because they are shown for both NCUC and NCSG at this screen – at this quick search. Can you open the first one, click the name, Maryam, (Gipa), see how this looks like here and scroll down a little.

Yes, this is, as I noted, a bit – more than a bit ugly. But hopefully you – is this actually useful at all? Should we just go by the email form? Robin?

Robin Gross: What?

Tapani Tarvainen: Is this display actually useful at all? It's rather too small to be seen.

Robin Gross: Yes, it's small.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, can you just bring up the email I sent today earlier, Maryam, that have these applications, the form inputs. I can – this is not (unintelligible) really. Okay I can bring up the – okay. Okay, we're having lots of technical difficulties it seems. So while – okay. While we're trying to display that I can speak a little more about the member database, which is the second item on the agenda, is overlapping this.

So it is intended to – at the moment, the functionality that we mostly have is basically just what we used to have with that Google Docs, but a bit prettier, but we are going to have things – generate automatic email mailing list management, it allows us to generate a mailing list by region and so forth, which we're now doing by a bit of a hack.

There will be a member view and that's something we'll have to work on next. And but we want to have a members having a profile how they can edit their own information.

And we of course intend to have a pretty front page for it as well so we actually have a NCSG.is front page Website that has something other than the ICANN wiki that's in it now. Martin, you have a comment?

Martin Silva Valent: Hello? Hello? Yes, I was wondering if it is even possible to have some sort of link with the eventual new membership application in NPOC so that when someone tries to register from the NPOC link it automatically starts the process in the NCSG application? Because we have a problem that a lot of people that try to join the constituency usually get lost on when they – that they have also to first apply to NCSG, NCSG has to approve it and then they can be approved or contemplated at NPOC.

And that creates a delay – delay time that is absolutely necessary I think NCSG should be the same problem. I don't know, maybe we can create some sort of one link thing where if someone starts and NCUC or NPOC application process it automatically starts the NCSG process, and we can even try to standardize the application so they can be more automatized. I don't know if that's possible, it's just an idea I throw in the table.

Robin Gross: Wouldn't that just be a virtue of on the NPOC Website just adding a link to the existing application or what am I...

Martin Silva Valent: It can be. We are – we are redoing from scratch the whole Website and a lot of other things. So that's why I'm throwing it as an idea. Maybe we can do it from NPOC without any sort of NCSG involvement. But I think it's nice that we try to coordinate if it's...

Tapani Tarvainen: Actually the very intent is to do that just that this (CDCRM) thing has NCUC and NPOC and NCSG memberships managed – the process we are planning that when NCSG Executive Committee approves it then it automatically drops to NCUC and NPOC their ECs, if they want or to their representatives if they – if you want to have your representatives in the NCSG EC do that without any further discussion either way but you have the same approve – just click okay, we approve this.

Martin Silva Valent: So the entry for the applications is going to be the same one for everyone in NCSG?

Tapani Tarvainen: The process is the same. But of – but up to you to decide who gets to approve them. And so there is a separate form there, will get you separate view when you log in as an NPOC EC member you get to see the new NPOC applications.

Martin Silva Valent: Perfect, perfect because my concern was that we are putting the burden of the double process on the new member and that's what – that was the trouble thing. Perfect. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: In the past the process has basically been that constituencies is – don't even process them, they just accept that they're representatives in NCSG do that, but we have a pretty interface and we can use it either way so and in any case I want you to have an automated notification that now you have new members.

Okay, we have falling back to the old ancient already-obsolete Google Docs at this point because that's what at least works. Sorry. We will fix this next week, but for now let's go through this. We will.

So let's take a look at the applications at this point. I guess you can open it for yourselves. Can't read it on that small screen. Let's start with the first application. (Segund Calabani), from Iran.

Robin Gross: So it looks like this person – when I went to the LinkedIn page we've got like 16 connections in common. So this definitely looks like somebody who's in the space and they have a reference but I don't recognize the person's name, (Madi Tagizada).

Tapani Tarvainen: I do. He got into our membership in Hyderabad.

Robin Gross: Okay. Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: And he's a good one.

Robin Gross: So I vote yes on this application.

Tapani Tarvainen: Poncelet? Can you please indicate your opinion, Poncelet, either on the Adobe chat or in the Google Doc? Okay, I see Poncelet is yes. I vote yes as well. Monika is missing so we'll approve pending Monika's opinion later.

Next. Can you scroll it down so we can see the name? Thank you. (Juan Masias) from Mexico. Opinions? Robin?

Robin Gross: Yes, I voted yes on this one as well. Looks like was the reference – no reference, okay. But, yes, I voted yes. I looked at the LinkedIn page and everything looks good.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan? Poncelet for (Masias)? Yes, from Poncelet as well. And I agree so again approved pending Monika. Opinion later. Then we have (Ishitam Kalik) from Pakistan. Referenced Ayden.

Robin Gross: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Monika – Robin?

Robin Gross: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Poncelet? And yes from Poncelet, agreed, so again approved pending Monika possibly objecting later. And that was all new individuals. Then we have new organizations. The first one I hope we know about European Retail Rights (Edri), opinions? Robin?

Robin Gross: I vote a very enthusiastic yes. I'm just thrilled to see their application here.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan? Poncelet? And a big yes from Poncelet, again, approved pending Monika later. I might note that I started speaking with (Edri) about possible application back in 2013

when they were not too enthusiastic then but for whatever reason now they have joined us and I'm very happy to see them.

And one more, Small and Medium Telecom Operators Association of Georgia. Robin?

Robin Gross: This looks like it's a commercial operation to me. Small and Medium Telecom Operators, they support the process of the telecommunication sector. I think they might be – I think they've perhaps applied by mistake. Maybe they belong in the – over in the Commercial Stakeholder Group. I think we should ask because it seems commercial to me.

Tapani Tarvainen: I also note – Joan?

Joan Kerr: I disagree, Robin. I think it looks like they're advocating for fairness and competition. Like that's not a – it doesn't seem commercial to me.

Robin Gross: I'm trying to get to their Website right now but just looking at the data in the application, improving the business environment, reducing barriers of entry into the telecommunications market, promoting competition in the telecommunication sector. Yes, that's what it looks like, a business union.

Tapani Tarvainen: Please turn your mic on when speaking. I'm looking at their Website, which is mostly in Georgian and which I can't read, but there is this one chapter in English when you click the English open and it does seem to be, as Robin said, some more of a trade association or the like. Okay now the English one opens up, it's a bit slow.

Joan Kerr: I agree.

Tapani Tarvainen: So shall we ask for more details or reject outright?

Robin Gross: I think we just send them a rejection, say it looks like you're business. If you feel we've mislabeled you, please tell us otherwise but.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, I see Joan concurring and since we basically reject everybody unless all of us agree, so that means that they are rejected. Maryam, please send them a rejection notice with the explanation that we think you are commercial but if you want to explain how you are not we'll welcome your explanation.

Okay, and that was all for new applications. We have some under review, do we? We don't. Is that correct, Maryam? We don't have anything – we have some individuals under review don't we? Two. Can see we have (Carlos Valenzuela Anyan), ask for more details and Maryam, is the situation that we did not get any response? Okay. And our policy being that if we ask for more explanation and we get no response then we reject so rejected.

And (Maureen Kendall), same situation, asked for clarification and no response so reject. And there were no organizations under review I see. So that was that for member applications, although I see we have received a new one just right now, but we will leave that until next time because we don't have time to put it in the system.

So that much for member applications. There was something else. The member removal procedures is still under construction. We'll have to return that to later. But let's look at the election. I have messed up with that one too. See if I've got the document here. Apologies for the delay here.

I hope Maryam will get this up in a moment. But besides the usual election process or rather that very thing, we have – it has not been exactly well documented. The last election we had a little trouble with this and so I wanted to clarify and go through and write out the procedures and processes in a pretty way.

There actually are quite a number of things going through what has been sort of assumed or done ad hoc or never decided because it wasn't actual type issues came up quite a long list. It's coming up. Can you see that? Is it readable in the Adobe? So first things like who is supposed to do what.

Our charter basically lands this on the chair and with the EC supervising. But in some instances it might be better if the chair was not responsible; in particular if the chair is a candidate him or herself. Should we have a process for doing something else instead? If we have a vice chair it would be nice but we don't usually have one. Otherwise the EC could presumably appoint someone else or should the – could the chair do that, delegate it out, I'm not sure. That's something we have to discuss.

I don't plan to have actually at any decisions on any of this today, this is just a list of things that we need to discuss and decide before the election comes up. So that's something. I find it a bit – it's a bit problematic if the chair is actually running the election and running as a candidate at the same time. So I'd rather have a way of say having the EC appoint someone else and what we do if nobody volunteer, I'm not sure what – anyway, that's one thing to think – decide.

The timeline, that is in principle should reasonably easy. We will have to work backward from when the councilors have to be known, have to decide at the timeline how many days, weeks, we need to have in each point. The ballot format, that depends also and it seems like what none of the above actually means but that's something that has varied quite a lot, mainly in every election the chair has just done whatever has felt good and mostly something different than the previous time. So that's – those are basically relatively straightforward things.

Then, there are a number of eligibility approvals and limitations in the charter, that come from the GNSO Operating Procedures and even ICANN bylaws that are not entirely obvious, some of them actually are clear enough but need to be opened up. The term limits, we had – most part they are obvious but one item that was not I have to check is that when somebody is elected midterm to the half term then that does not count in the term limit. If we can consider in the Council so that if somebody is appointed as a temporary replacement into the council they can still do full terms after that.

But on the other way around it does not work if you have done two full terms you cannot be appointed even a temporary alternate at that situation. So that just has to be written down so that everybody understands it.

But the less obvious things are there's balance, approvals, the regional balance, our charter says that there should be a reasonable effort to get someone from all regions. And that to the maximum extent possible there should be no more than two from any region. Now what exactly does to the maximum extent possible mean? And what does reasonable effort constitute of?

When we've been doing temporary replacement discussions there was some talk about can we – how hard is this to the maximum extent possible? Can we override it if we feel that one candidate is way – in the election situation I think it's reasonably clear if somebody is a candidate then we have to take what whoever fulfills this that even if say from continent X are all candidates from there get a zillion votes and from all continents we have candidates getting just one vote we still have to pick the better ones.

But in the case that the EC is making a decision is this a hard limit or can we even consider like skip somebody who – and actually in that situation we don't even formally have candidates, the process of doing that is also something we need to open up, that should we always issue a call for volunteers to the discuss list like we did now or something else? And does the EC have any leeway in interpreting this particular case?

And one doubtful point here that some people can or have arguably multiple regions or can choose their region in one way or the other? There is not well defined in some borderline cases, the rule may just be in that whichever country you pay your taxes to is the primary definition, but some people pay taxes to multiple countries. Citizenship, you can have any number of those residents. Well, how far should this weigh so we have to think how to deal with this.

And at what point, again, timelines should this be decided because people are supposed to declare their region earlier on or actually at what point we have to – again

something we should set some deadlines, time limits to. And that second limitation we have is gender balance, which says that, again, the reasonable effort to make it balanced and under no circumstance says that there should be less than two of any gender. That again leaves open what's the reasonable effort for getting it exactly balanced.

And shall we consider the situation that there might not be enough candidates at all from either gender? In that situation shall we just postpone the election and keep digging until we get enough candidates? And again, another thing is some people may not have a – there are two common genders, we have transgender people how do we deal with those so that kind of issues need to be considered.

And it would be nice to come up with clean rules, it may turn that we can't solve all of this in advance, but try to come up with everything possible we might end up trouble with. And I already alluded to the –okay, Matthew, you have a comment?

Matthew Shears: Matthew Shears. Tapani, just a question. Are you going to go through this and then you're going to ask for comments or is this just informational? When do you want people who have thoughts to interject? Sorry, just...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: You're welcome – if you want feel welcome to interject at any time. But the point I want to go through at least that today and then send it out to the mailing list where it hasn't gone up even though I tried. And try to get through this list before the election actually before Johannesburg meeting but today we can discuss as much as we have time. So I'll ask – so if you have something at any given point we have time now because we ran quickly through the other items. Feel free to interrupt but we can come back to whatever is interesting as we get to the end of the list.

So I was saying that we have to discuss how the rules apply if there's any difference when you are appointing temporary alternates and replacements. Noting that the EC has not – no specific rules on how to seek for candidates and so forth so that's one

thing. And in that kind of a candidate search or selection what EC should interpret these rules.

It was suggested to me I think – I'm not sure if others at least that in such a situation the EC could consider abilities of competence of someone potential just candidate and override this but especially the region, (unintelligible) maximum extent possible, what is possible is that maybe it should be someone who's actually capable of doing the job. So that kind of arguments can be made. But especially if we don't have even a procedure for how do we look at possibilities that's – makes it a bit more complicated.

Scroll down a little, Maryam. Am I missing some comment from – let's see. Small screen here. So, Maryam. Okay, while we're waiting for Maryam to scroll down, okay, be too much there. Next one I was – this voting process, okay, this overlaps what I had earlier on the time limits and deadlines during a voting process when we set up, for example, how long exactly should the voting start. It has been two weeks, but typically is the beginning at some time during the daytime and ending at the end of the 14th day so it has been a bit less, a bit more. So should we fix these timelines, always decide it's always a midnight UTC or something at the end.

And then interpreting the results, if there is a tie two people get exactly same number of votes, how do we break these ties. Again, we can refer to this balancing rules if it turns out that it's otherwise exactly equal then we should prefer minority in one way or the other, should we even consider long-term balance there, let's say in some region has had fewer representatives in the past in the long-term and then they should be preferred or should we just make a lottery of it?

So that's something to consider. I don't have any strong opinions on any of these items, by the way, so this is just kind of (unintelligible) here. And we can also discuss whether we keep on using the ICANN election system and ICANN staff managing the election or pull out something else. If are there any issues with that we are concerned with.

How do we deal exceptions here? As the system now is the ICANN staff member managing them actually sees the ballots coming in and can for example, point out that this is invalid ballot and ask for new one or should we just automatically reject such ballots? So that's something we should consider review.

Okay, and situations that can have another exceptions, what if the candidate actually pulls out halfway through the election or at any point, are there any special considerations that are not obvious that we should discuss? And are there any – or what kind of extraordinary circumstances might call for election be cancelled, a vote restarted and how should that be done? We just – if say if the ballot is decided to be so bad if it's confusing, as was argued in the last election, maybe how should that be done with the same candidates, what kind of timelines, processes be done there? So that kind of problems may come again.

And one issue that has come up a number of times is that if they have an organization's representative who is also an individual member, can they vote on both roles and are there any considerations to that? We have discussed it and as far as we can tell the charter has nothing against this. And in the past they have been able to vote like this, but it's not entirely obvious if they should. And can we prohibit that without changing the charter?

So that's something that should be decided at some point. And then the infamous none of the above. Actually it's not entirely clear because if our charter allows having none of the above in the ballot. It's been argued it does not because it's not mentioned there but it has also been argued that it's obvious that it should be allowed. So we certainly discuss it.

And then how does it matter? What kind of significance does none of the above have? It turned out that there were at least four different obvious interpretations to that so it should be fixed and decided before the election. The alternatives being like it reading like a blank vote which was how I thought it would be and the most usual thing, but some people want it to be an untie vote. That's explicitly against someone – it might prevent someone getting elected. And we might even have two different types of none

of the aboves maybe done so that if you don't click any option then it's blank vote and if you click the – tick the none of the above that counts as sort of untie vote as it apparently that been in the past even though this has never been a practical issue and it was – in terms of how it was. But still that's something that should be decided.

And relating to that then how should it be proceeded to ballot to make it okay, it comes back to earlier point of what the ballot should look like so that this is clear enough what it means. Okay, that's the end of my list now. Does anybody have any other things that's missing from the list, other things that election should be documented, missing or decided or what?

As a general point, I'll note that we are of course bound here by ICANN bylaws and the GNSO Operating Procedures and by our own charter, and we may find a need to find a list of things we want to change in our own charter to make it the way we want because some of these are not obvious that we may end up in a situation we want to do something our charter does not allow.

Seeing no hands up so I think I have a long enough list. We have time now, anybody want to comment on any particular item on this list how we should do and start discussion? Matthew?

Matthew Shears: Can we go back up? Can we go back to the (unintelligible) please?

Tapani Tarvainen: Maryam, scroll down.

Matthew Shears: I mean, I can give some immediate reactions, if that would at all be helpful?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, go ahead.

Matthew Shears: Fine. So I think either in the situation you raised with regards to the chair, I think either the chair has to recues themselves or there should be a vice chair. I think it's – you can do both or you can do one or the other and I think that would solve the issue so that you could either – the chair should either recuse themselves or there should be a

vice chair. I think those are the two options that you would typically have in a situation like that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Just if the chair recuses himself or herself, who takes over?

Martin Silva Valent: If we don't have a vice chair, the common – the reason is that the rest of the ExComm that is not – that has not asked to be excused will take the (unintelligible) collectively or they can nominate someone for that specific task. So I think that would be the legal logic behind that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, that's actually what I had in mind that I would – that situation that what the chair should do is to ask the EC to appoint someone amongst themselves or even some outsider from (unintelligible) to take over. But it's also a bit sometimes difficult when – when does the chair know that he or she will be really a candidate? Is appointed halfway through the process, so we have to be like should perhaps always have a backup person named in advance?

Matthew Shears: Yes, Matthew again. I do prefer a vice chair role because there will be situations when the chair may not be available to be a chair or may not be attending meetings or whatever reason.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I absolutely agree, but getting the vice chair elected has not been entirely easy in the past, I have tried a couple of times. So we might even, as a potential charter fix is to mandate a vice chair election, but at the moment we don't have that but so we can't rely on that as yet. Any other opinions on this item?

Martin?

Martin Silva Valent: No, I was going to ask the ExComm if there are any specific issue or question from that list that you would like to us to brainstorm about?

Tapani Tarvainen: All of them.

Martin Silva Valent: We can help you with one specific like throw it out there. No, any? Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Joan.

Joan Kerr: For me Number 2 is – I'd really like to understand in quotation, to the extent possible – maximum extent possible and reasonable because it's so generic. I think for me, you know, to be able to point to something saying this is what it means and this is why we proceeded this way.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, thank you, Joan. And I just asked to remind people to state your names before speaking. And this is Tapani speaking for the record. Yes, that's exactly why I brought this up here, this generic difficult to – open to interpretation.

But the way I read that to the maximum extent possible in the election situation it's reasonably clear, that we have to prefer someone from underrepresented region even if they get less votes. Martin.

Martin Silva Valent: I remember I had this talk in Copenhagen – in Reykjavik last – a few weeks ago, and I found that it helped the idea if someone is ideal enough and the regional balance demands it then he has to be – he has to have the privilege of the candidacy even if there's someone more ideal but it goes against the regional balance So as long as someone is ideal enough for the position maybe then regional balance wins even if someone is more ideal because of more experience or something else. It's about prioritize. Once you have the first priority that is ideal person then the next period comes along maybe is regional balance, gender balance, and those issues.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. And that was Martin Silva Valent speaking. So yes, as I said ,in an election situation if it's just the regional balance coming up, it's reasonably clear that less represented regions should override in case otherwise we'd end up with three from some region. But the reasonable effort is harder to interpret and if we have a situation where the region balance and gender balance conflict how we deal with that.

Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Matthew Shears. I guess I would look at this a little bit differently. I guess I would say what's the balance across the Executive Committee? Right, if you have to make decisions like that. Because if there's a balance across the Executive Committee where clearly there's the right kind of skill set that you need on the one hand, and you've got the regional balance on the other hand, that's great. But I think if you're looking at one candidate or two for a regional position, I think you have to look at what's needed across the Executive Committee as a whole as well. Or at least that should be a consideration I think. Yes, a realistic approach.

Tapani Tarvainen: We are not talking about Executive Committee, because the NCSG Executive Committee is elected differently; we are talking about the Council members and the chair elections, which all of NCSG elects. But the point you're making regarding the – then the constituency level elections that will be applicable. But of course we can't have these balance issues for chair, actually also that's (unintelligible) only one chair. But if we actually do put a vice chair election then it's quite considered there, but for Council that's where these rules apply.

And I'm not sure we can come up with any easy rule but it would be ideal if we can come up with really a hard algorithmic rule for picking up resolving these in advance because if it happens and we don't have such rules, then figuring it out in this situation we already have people's names on the table it's going to be ugly, difficult to do.

So we should look out this issues in the wider context say for example, some region when gender could be underrepresented in ICANN in the whole, for example it was argued when we filled up the last temporary alternate position here that the gender balance should not act against women in this particular situation even if it had resulted in a small imbalance in their favor because the women are generally underrepresented within ICANN. And that could be – but I think such arguments should be like documented and decided in advance before the committee comes up so such things matter.

And likewise for regional representation, that we have certain regions very much underrepresented in the ICANN in the whole and even in our own group within the long-term, we have very few Africans, and nobody from Antarctica but that doesn't actually count. But still, what kind of – how can we consider these kinds of issues and can we come up with a clear cut rules because – and if we can't then we'll have to come up with who decides when it – there is no other rule that works.

And taking that kind of (unintelligible) whether we can decide it then we toss the coin or something like that but even then I'd like to have it decided and documented in advance. Maryam, we seem to have lost the screen. Or is it the local tech? Oh yes, it's in the – can you fix that? Okay, this – okay that's a local problem here.

Any other thoughts on this? You think we can come up with a pretty solution that works, Mathew?

Matthew Shears: Matthew Shears. In a way, we are encouraged to do that because we have the SO/AC accountability process that's underway that's looking and we have the diversity process that's underway as well in Work Stream 2 so there are – there are things that are going to probably push us in that direction to come up with some kind of guidance for our own workings. So I think, you know, it's something that we should give consideration to.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, we might even try to be exemplary in this and come up with rules that others can then emulate. Are there any other issues here that look difficult that – or you want to comment on this point? Does anybody have concerns about ICANN managing the elections? No?

I guess all of this are mostly such that we can try to come up with some kind of solution but we have – some of them will be – I suspect will require us to consider changing our charter just, for example, that well I'm not sure exactly what we can do within our charter what we have but it would be nice to make it clear that we are not violating our own charter whatever we do.

Okay, anybody want to comment on any of these? Matthew again.

Matthew Shears: Sorry. Matthew again. The last point, Point 4, I think it was on the NOTA, I would very much encourage us to remove this construct from – if we move forward to Number 4? Yes. The NOTA option, and to give the option to vote against as opposed to just voting for this illusion of a candidate. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: So you are arguing that there should be a negative vote consent? Okay. Robin?

Robin Gross: Yes, I agree with Matt in the sense that I think it's important that we have a means to vote against any candidate, but I do feel as we've seen, that this particular construct of NOTA is just too confusing, it gives out too many differing interpretations. So that needs to be cleaned up. We could probably just get NOTA off and you could do it with either vote yes or no for each candidate, for example. And that's just a suggestion, I don't know that that's really the way to go too. But the point is is we can get rid of NOTA as long as we have some means of saying no.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, I note that in – this has been discussed in quite a number of contexts as well. And my impression is that in most elections the notion of a – being able to get negative votes have not been a good idea because it tends to kill the possibility of minorities to get their own candidates – having representation. Whether that's applicable in our case is debatable.

But the options range, indeed from having no – not option at all, you even to the extent that you have to pick exactly an options of the available candidates, or that you can (unintelligible) using a blank vote, or that you could have a – for each candidate a yes, no, that type of approval voting is possible. But this is certainly something that's not – does not have one easy obvious alternative and they will have to discuss with their membership at large.

And of course I'll have to point out that usually the problem is that we don't have even enough candidates or just as many as we have positions. And that does not make this kind of – well actually this NOTA has never had any impact on any real election and I

don't see it's likely to, but if we make it an explicit anti-vote it might encourage people to do that and I'm not sure that would be good in the process also and running for elections, not to mention that minority issue I just mentioned. Joan, you look like you want to say something?

Joan Kerr: Yes, it's Joan for the record. I really don't get the NOTA. I honestly don't. I know we went through it. If you have an election, I don't understand the applicability of that option. Either vote for someone and the person that you think will fit that position or you don't. I just – for me personally I would vote that it's off.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, anyway this is something we need to discuss in a wider context. Well anything else on this matter? Okay. And since we don't have that – any progress in the member removal procedures either, so we have – that's the end of our agenda. Any other business anybody wants to bring to the attention of the Executive Committee?

Okay one thing I might bring up relating to this and others that we should really make a list of issues with our charter that might merit changing and when the list grows long enough then we start actually doing it. Because there are some ambiguities and difficult things there. But that's, again, for a long term project.

Oh, so nothing else? Shall we conclude the meeting here? Okay, Martin.

Martin Silva Valent: I have one question of membership. In the case of organizations, for instance, it can be – it could be my case but it can be a lot of people's cases, if an organization becomes elected for a leadership position, it can be chair of NCSG. And responsible, say, for instance, you, Tapani, you change from your current NGOs to another NGO. Does that mean that you're no longer the chair? I mean, the position follows the NGO or follows the elected candidate? That would be my question. I've never heard about someone discussing that. But it's a doubt I have. Is it understood the question?

Robin Gross: I can just tell you what I think. I think you elect a person, an individual and so, you know, if – yes, that follows that person. And not an organization, we don't really do it that way. I don't know if anybody disagrees with me but.

Joan Kerr: But, I hear you, but I think what you're saying is that person is actually representing an organization in order to be on the committee in the first place, right? So it's a really good point. It would be really good if the updates follow the schedule of the elections because then it becomes irrelevant if that person moves on to another organization. Do you see what I'm saying?

Robin Gross: Yes, I see what you're saying but I sort of see it as two different issues. One being – yes, one being the issue of, you know, you elect the individual and other being, well, is there – once they're elected and they take a different position, how does their eligibility change? And so I would say unless there is, you know, unless they've suddenly become ineligible they now, you know, are with a – working with a large commercial organization, I think they would need to reapply as an individual or switch their membership to individual.

But I kind of see these as two different questions because one is just about eligibility in terms of being a member, and then the other is about who holds the role, the elected role?

Joan Kerr: Sorry, go ahead.

Martin Silva Valent: My question at first was with (Chung) in the terms of I think that when it comes to legal representation NGO goes into contract, it doesn't matter who signs it, it matters who the NGO eventually appoints as an – after contract representative. But in this case, yes, I tend to agree after thinking a little bit with Robin in terms of the community puts its trust in the candidate, and it makes sense for the functionality of the positions. Is just part of the rules when the NGO agrees. NGO agrees that whatever representative it will put in, is selected will eventually have to end the term by itself.

So I think you could also use voluntary agreement sort of argument that the NGOs accept this rule when they appoint someone is part of the risk of getting into an election, if that person later on gets out of NGO he will remain with the position until another term.

Tapani Tarvainen: I'll look this up in our charter. I have to take the (unintelligible) but correctly and it is actually well defined there. It says, "If an official representative holds an elected office in the NCSG, and is subsequently replaced the elected office will be vacant and subject to filing by the NCSG according to procedures," (unintelligible) a vacation. So if you are elected as the chair or something, as a representative of an organization, and you no longer are representative in that organization, then you're out and there will be a new election or vacation by EC or whatever.

Martin Silva Valent: Okay so it's more in the (Chung) sort of way. Okay. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: So for once we have a clear answer in our charter to the situation. Although I note that this says that only the official representative – I believe we – actually I'm not sure but I think we cannot elect an additional representative to such an office anyway. So that doesn't apply. Yes, I think that's the case. Joan.

Joan Kerr: So this brings up the other point of having either a vice chair or something to step in if something like that – actually because that could actually create an issue as well.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well, there is also a rule that if the chair resigns, for example, then the EC elects a replacement. But I agree that having a vice chair would be a very good idea in general. And that...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, and I would release it just that one of the things to fix in the charter is to make a vice chair election mandatory one way or the other. Any other questions regarding this or any other subject, any other business is the agenda item now. One, two, three, good. So okay thank you, everybody. That concludes our meeting, you can stop the recording and whatever is going on. Thank you, everybody.

END