ICANN

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 4, 2016
1:00 pm CT

Chnatelle Doerksen: The recordings have started.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay everybody. So I'm Tapani Tarvainen from NCSG. I'm co-chairing this with Lori Schulman from IPC. And the issue at hand is that NCPH at times needs to select people, notably vice chairs for the GNSO and the board member, and there are no clearly defined procedures or processes for doing that. And that that has in the past caused some confusion let's say that per selection - election has not proceeded as smoothly as it might have.

Now we are proposing now that we start by discussing the vice chair election, splitting this discussion that way at first, talk about the vice chair election and then about the board member election. But we are open to the room if you prefer to speak up since they all of course overlap as well so that the processes may be more or less similar. So but let's start with the vice chair election on the grounds that it is more timely. It will be the first one we will meet and also the more recent experience with that having just elected one. And without further ado actually, I will open up the floor for discussion although noting that quite a few people are out getting coffee I presume. So does anybody want to speak? Okay I see Jimson. Okay you go ahead.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you (unintelligible) chair and co-chair. Is it possible for us to have a
                    recap of the current process? You know, I believe there are a number of
                    people here that are not aware of the current process for selecting the board
                    seat, (unintelligible) for the board seat and the council too. Can we have a
                    quick run on the current process please?

Tapani Tarvainen: I wish we could but the whole point is that we don't really have a process at
                    all. It's informal discussions that eventually wind up in some kind of
                    consensus hopefully in time. If somebody with experience in the past would
                    like to explain how it has happened as an example, I would be happy to let
                    you speak. Okay Heather will you (unintelligible)?

Heather Forrest: Thanks Tapani. As I understand it not so much related to this recent, it's been
                    a very informal process. It's been a discussion between the parties involved.
                    Here's an idea. Float the idea. Discuss the idea on email and that's all that's
                    happened.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Exactly that there has been and there is no formal process. NCPH does
                    not have any charter or bylaws as itself. It's simply a collection of two
                    stakeholder groups that have to somehow make a decision. So it has been a
                    rather haphazard thing so to speak. Okay I see Sam wants to speak. Go ahead
                    Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you Tapani. Following up on Jimson's request, could we at least get a
                    kind of recount of the scenario that transpired? So a sort of kind of what
                    happened. I mean not explaining how it fit into the procedures but I mean I
                    was there as it happened and I was just left confused.

Lori Schulman: I'd like to respond to that and then Maria right after or firstly. It doesn't a matter.

Maria Farrell: It's just a follow-up question. Something that would help me is if it is on the agenda I imagine that you had some difficulties in the past. So what exactly have been these difficulties that we had in the process? And so we are in a better position to make suggestions to you to improve it and if there are strengths in the way that we conduct things. Which are the date?

Lori Schulman: Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: I just sent out my retriever and hopefully he comes back with after you should have a complete overview of the history and of the procedure and what happens. So hopefully we can do that. There she comes. I'm proud of my retriever. Thank you (Rob).

Lori Schulman: No we were relying on you for some organizational history, historical perspective on the choices for vice chair and how it's worked. But before we do that, I have a thought about sort of rehashing the past because I have a different question and that is not what's happened in the past is it's so important. But how do we want things to work in the future? Because I'm a little reticent I guess to talk about the past because at times the past has been contentious. And is there a way that we could formulate some ideas of a framework that we'd like to have, formalize it in a way that would create common understandings and a more smooth process?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes but nonetheless we want some kind of idea of what has happened in the past before we can go out for too in the future. So Avri please.

Avri Doria: Thanks Avri speaking. Forgive me for taking an authorized break but it's what happens if there isn't one scheduled. I just sort of, you know, yes. Anyway so I have to ask a question. Are we asking about both positions or just the chair - or I mean the vice chair or and in fact even the chair because when we're talking about it - the nomination for chair that that's one of the issues. Or just the board issue or all three of them? And of course I understand you want me to do a history without getting into the past.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay we - yes the idea was to start with vice chair or chair election process.

Avri Doria: Okay. So in the past, we basically had a notion of alternating with each of the SGs picking a candidate and then that candidate going through a vote to make sure that we had someone that was acceptable to both sides. And to make sure that someone is acceptable to both sides basically required a threshold of eight votes among the council members so that the task couldn't be captured by one SG plus the non-comm person assigned to that house.

                    So therefore it takes eight votes. Now one of the - and sometimes it's worked very well. We've had a competent person, you know, for example for a couple years. We had a very good vice chair from the commercial side, from the ISPs that everybody was fond of and it was really quite easy to approve. And even when we came to an impasse the next year to say eh let him do it another year, you know, because we can't.

                    But one of the problems that happens is that sometimes groups pick a strong person from within that stakeholder group that is in some sense that stakeholder group's favorite paladin, favorite fighter of some sort. And that person is not necessarily acceptable to the other side. And I can say that safely because I've often been in that situation. And so we end up with an impasse. And once we get with that impasse it becomes difficult. So where it broke

down a couple years ago is when it was the NCSG's turn to pick someone but the CSG just could not agree with our pick. And it was our turn. And we eventually called the ombudsman in and the ombudsman helped us reach the decision about keeping the CSG person for another year because we were also fond of him and, you know, the next year continuing the process.

But we've never managed to get to that point where, you know, and this is where you start to look at one of those election procedures that maybe picks the second favorite person from a stakeholder group that is acceptable to the other group. Finding a way of building a process that isn't guaranteed to block or almost guaranteed to block. I think there was a lot of good reason in that alternating year theory. When the alternating theory - year theory came up -- and I was one of the ones, not the only one, not even the main one that pushed that -- there was the notion that if person A from the non-commercial did a good job and was acceptable the CSG might actually approve them continuing but also they might put up someone of their own.

And, you know, the fact is that reached an impasse too often. This time it didn't because we had a good candidate for chair that we finally managed to agree to that unfortunately was available for the vice chair role. So, you know, it was an easy decision for us to make as a group. But I really don't know how we managed to get by that particular thing that happens when a group puts up their favorite person but that person is not acceptable to the other side and therefore can never break that super majority requirement. And that's where it's been.

Sometimes the groups - the stakeholder groups have more trust of each other. Sometimes they have less trust of each other. It really depends on what policy battles we happen to be fighting at the time and whether we happen to mostly be on the same side or not. And the election of a vice chair should not really

be as subject to that policy pressure as it should be to the competent manager, you know, that's able to be neutral definition. So I don't know if that covers what you wanted without diving deep into history and getting into gory details.

Lori Schulman: Yes I was going to say right. To do the high level without getting into the gory details I think is what's important. I also think it's important to really think about understanding that there has been many instances of impasse or painful rounds -- I'll call them painful rounds -- where we've gone round after round after round whether it's been to choose a board representative or to choose a chair or vice chair. It creates even more anxiety in the room and more problems I think sometimes than it may be worth. So I think the challenge is really to figure out is there a process that could minimize the amount of time that we would spend on an impasse. That would be my thought and I see that Klaus raised his hand. Does anybody else have their hand or placard up. Okay so Klaus and then Greg.

Klaus Stoll: For me the last time (Routen) I'm sorry that I will name names because the perfect example is Heather and it showed for me what we have to look at is not policies. We have to look at abilities. We should have a litmus test. Is the person which is proposed able to fulfill their job? Do they have the talent to do that? I mean you should look really at where they come from, what they do, what their policies are second. And that is - for me is litmus test because with Heather at the end it was all about oh she comes from the wrong side and not about what Heather actually can do. And I think it's more important that we have a person that actually can fill the role instead of a person who's pushing a policy. And I think that is a good - this is a good test to not to start where do they come from but can they actually do it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Klaus. And (Greg)?

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I'll - Greg Shatan. I'll agree, you know, that abilities and management competence important and also a commitment to primarily being the neutral manager along with the board chair and to representing the interests of the house as a whole and not using the vice chair position to score points for whichever stakeholder group you're from. It has to be really important. That's an important maturational process for the non-contracted party's house. You know, the more that we believe that the other stakeholder group is going to use the vice chair position as a tool for their policies over ours, whoever, you know, whichever side you're from, the more immature we are as a governing institution and the - it makes it harder to kind of to move forward.

So I think, you know, we really, you know, need to, you know, the - look at that as an it's a policy management position. And I think that the unfortunately, you know, not to dredge things up too much but I think the last chair election kind of set us back a little bit in that regard. But I'm hoping that, you know, we've, you know, we did kind of - we've recovered our footing hopefully on that point. So I think we, you know, need to move forward.

And specifically, you know, I think that an alternating system, you know, just keeps coming back to being the system that makes sense, you know, probably more likely on a two year basis than a one year basis because there's a learning curve in the first year and you want somebody who has actually, you know, has grown into the job and not just have to, you know, have this constant resetting. And I think the more we can trust each other and the more that the chair views themselves as the house's chair, vice chair rather as opposed to the stakeholder group, so the constituency's chair, the better off we all are. And that starts with the selection process. So I encourage us to grow up on this subject collectively. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Greg and but the problem is sometimes we do not have that kind of nice agreement and we need to have or would like to have process and procedures that work even when there is some - somebody wants to play it ugly or we can't really sometimes lose the trust. I think the process, even the informal process we have now actually works quite well when we have people that trust each other and find a candidate that works.

But the whole point of having processes is that they should work in the difficult situations. When we come up with an impasse that one or the other side does have the candidate that they want to push and the other does not like that, how do we work around that? So can we find some kind of election process that would help that kind of situation? Or is this just a hopeless situation and we just have to keep on talking and talking. Okay Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Yes. I'm just repeating myself. Why don't - if a situation like that comes, the criteria of the group which objects to a person has to say - has to prove that the objection is based on their opinion that the person is just not capable to do the job they're asked to do based on their ability and not based on their affiliation. I think we should move the discussion from the politics away to the ability.

Tapani Tarvainen: That is very good idea but how do you implement that if people are not willing to play along? So we don't have any formal ability criteria and I don't see we can have any thought - we could - it would have been very nice to have that as a principle. But okay. I see Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Tapani. This is Heather. Out of curiosity, why is it that we're not able to specify a certain high level list of let's say a job description if you like, a position description? Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: That actually would be one nice thing to do. Any volunteers for drafting that? Should we set up a working group to draft a criteria?

Lori Schulman: I'm wondering if now would be the time. I mean we have, you know, not quite an hour - a little more than an hour. Would the group agree to brainstorm, to use the rest of the time? Because there's a lot of quiet in the room when this is a room that's typically quite verbal. So I find it interesting on this subject there's a lot of silence from everybody. It's pretty universal. Yes because it is. There's personalities involved and that's why I again Tapani and I have a big task here to keep this impersonal, to keep it high level, to keep it principled. And that's where the challenges. Can - has anybody ever in the room just a show of hands sat down and even thought about a process? Yes Marilyn has a question.

Marilyn Cade: I have a question. When we formed ICANN and we invited the 20 governments that - remember that when we formed ICANN there were less than 400 million users on the internet. Most of the internet users came from 12 countries. We were lucky to get about 20 governments to come. We only had a GAC chair. A few years later we had about 80 governments and then there were two - they added two vice chairs. Just recently, the GAC added regional distribution and vice chairs. Have we considered that it might be time given the bulk of work that there could four? There could be a chair and then three co-chairs. So there - the chair, whichever house, comes from then the other sorry stakeholder group has a vice chair and the other two vice chairs are from. Do we need to keep it only two? We have a hell of a lot of work to do. That was a technical term for the transcript.

Tapani Tarvainen: So we are proposing that we increase the number of vice chairs so that there is - each stakeholder group gets their own? I guess that would solve that

particular impasse but that would have to be decided I guess on the GNSO level. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. But that then would leave the notion that we could not therefore pick our non-comm appointee as the vice chair if we were having one from each of the stakeholder groups. Or are we saying we would have three? Just real quickly, I modify my proposal to be able to ensure that that person could also be considered. But just the idea that rather than saying the pie is only, you know, as big as a coffee cup, maybe the pie is as big as a saucer.

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm not sure how that would work out if we're getting choosing two vice chairs. Then neither stakeholder group is likely to hand it over to the non-comm appointee or who knows probably they would. Okay.

Mark McFadden: And Marilyn or Avri can answer this question for me but is there any - is there a reason why the GNSO has not used or looked at the procedures that other supporting organizations have to do this exact thing? The supporting organization that I was a part of in a previous life, the chair of, has extremely detailed procedures in place for not only selecting its chair but the mechanisms for selecting multiple vice chairs. Why wouldn't the GNSO profit from the experience of other supporting organizations in this way?

Avri Doria: Probably because it wasn't invented here.

Mark McFadden: Understood. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. Well perhaps we could add to my idea that we think outside the box to seeing if we could invite a quick, you know, informational understanding of what some of other supporting organizations do and share that in a working session.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes thank you Marilyn and Mark but if we are to increase the number of vice chairs, we'll have to take this to the GNSO level. At the moment it's that which house has their own vice chair.

Avri Doria: Is it possible for Mark to give us a quick rundown of the system that would make everybody okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay Mark.

Mark McFadden: It is possible but you would have to give me like three or four minutes to find the Web site. But it's possible. I was there at the beginning of this process of building that. So if you give me a couple of minutes, I would come back and then take two or three minutes of your time and talk about the mechanism that's placed in the address supporting organization.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay we'll get back to you in four minutes. In the meantime, Klaus by Rudy.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes thank you Tapani. Rudy for the transcript. Well I have to inform you that as I'm the chair of SEI and the standard committee on improvement of implementation we have this request coming from the council to look into the issue of the election of the chair of the GNSO. And we are looking into the process to see if we can find similar issues and ways it has been handled in other SOs and ACs in order to be able to produce a procedure that fits everything. And perhaps it should be the council asking the SEI to have a look into not only the chair person but also to see if there is a need for extension or a review of the concept of the vice chairs or co-chairs. Then the SEI could create necessary procedures to allow such a change because it has to go through the changes of the GNSO procedures.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Rudy. I see next would be Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. I guess, you know, one way to solve a problem is to change the problem. So then that is I think a long term solution and certainly one that should be explored and not taking the current setup for granted. But that's a long term solution. I doubt that we will make that change in time for the next go around which is, you know, in ten months or so. So I think we need to, you know, stick with the current problem as well as changing the definition of the problem and try to solve the problem we have in front of us.

And I think it is a litmus test for whether the house works and I think we, you know, have that question coming up whether the house even works, whether the house system works, whether the GNSO structure works. You know, the last GNSO review somehow managed to avoid reviewing the GNSO. But putting that aside, you know, that, you know, putting that problem aside, I think, you know, it's up to us in here to try to find a way forward together and I think it goes back to, you know, it's, you know, finding a process that works even when there is no trust is, you know, one way to define the problem. I think it goes back to but it's a kind of a lower level solution.

And I think the higher level solution is how - is trying hard - harder to build trust and trying within each organization not to use the vice chair seat to score points or to feel like it's being used to score points as such. You know, as long as we're in this together, we need to find a, you know, the best way to govern it. You know, in a sense we have the same problem in the commercial stakeholder group. We have three organizations that are essentially independent and that have differing views. But we - when we're faced with dealing with, you know, places where we're being referred to as such, we have to find our way out of it in a way that's, you know, mature and gets business done. So I think, you know, we need to find that way to mature. And, you

know, I think ultimately there is no great solution that's going to work in a lack of trust situation.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Greg. I have next Sam. Okay Susan?

Susan Payne: Thank you. I think I'd just - I think I'm sort of going to mirror what Greg was said - was saying slightly in that I think there are things that can be looked at which are longer term and have - asking the SEI to do something, for example, is very useful. But we have an hour here now and this seems to me to be like a really great opportunity if we don't have criteria for what a suitable vice chair should be able to demonstrate. We could sit and brainstorm. I actually don't think it would be that hard to do it and we'd come out of this meeting with something really tangible. And then whether that's supplied to, you know, the stakeholder group, you know, maybe proposing two candidates rather than just one or something like that, you know, that's another issue. But I think we could then come out with a sort of job description for who, you know, what a suitable candidate should look like and therefore what would be reasonable criteria for objecting to someone?

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Susan. I think Rudy wanted on this point. Did I get you right? No. Okay Carlos?

Carlos Guiterrez: Yes thank you. I think Greg's comments can become much more positive. Why to discuss vice chairs? I mean each group has a representative or a speaker. They are effectively a management group and so let's eliminate some layers. I mean if each group has a chair or a speaker or a representative, we have a representative of each group they sit together and they sort it out. They check if the candidates fulfill the qualifications or not and they put them for a vote. We are creating more layers and more layers supposedly being a bottom up organization of course, creating more layers of hierarchy while each group

has a clear voice. I mean let's get the representatives of all groups together and sort this out. I don't think it's worth the time.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Carlos. I have next Joan.

Joan Kerr: Sure. It's Joan for the record. I'm looking forward to having the discussion. I have a question. Is there a process where the former chair of any stakeholder group has recommendations for the next chair?

Tapani Tarvainen: None I know of.

Joan Kerr: See to me like I've been the chair of a lot of groups especially for politics and of course the rules are set. And one of the ways to address this whole issue of trust and transparency and fairness is actually to have responsibilities written out so that someone knows. But a big thing is asking the previous chair is what are some recommendations for the next chair? There is also, at least in Canada anyway, for chairs to be ex officios of a group so that they're there as an - in an advisory capacity as well. So I don't know if that's something that we can discuss. It's just that I noticed that there's so much work when you're the chair and that will scare a lot of people off. So and adding vice chairs also add work because yes they'll do work but it's also another layer. So I just wanted to ask about the recommendation. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you Joan. At this point I have to remember. Certain organizations run a system of like a troika where we have always the chair or the president and the president elect who's been elected to follow them and the previous elected put in together. That kind of system would bring continuity but I'm not sure how well it would work for us. But now Avri is next.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I wanted to comment on two points. One, I think this is something that we need to figure out in the house and not dump on the SEI. So I would recommend we resist that particular easy path. You know, handing it to somebody else is relatively easy but then you have to be willing to take what they give you back and that. On the other, I - on trust I think it's wonderful and in the best of all possible worlds we would always all trust each other. The point is that that world rarely coincides with the world we live in. And so it's really important to have a fairly neutral process that terminates and can terminate without prejudice and such. And so I'm really hoping that the four minutes is up and we can hear how to make it work.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay Mark have you found the Web site you were looking for?

Mark McFadden: Yes. Thank you very much. And before I talk about the ASOAC, let me make a couple points here. The first one and you'll hear this from technical people often, your mileage may vary. The fact is is that the ASO is not the GNSO. The GNSO has on its plate far more work than the ASO ever does. I say that without prejudice as a former chair. Second of all in regards to some comments that were made earlier, even in the ASO having co-chairs has been a very valuable feature of the work of the ASO because the ASO often is unable to travel and represent the supporting organization. It's the workload sharing activity and so forth. Let me then say that (Chantelle's) been kind of enough to share the URL for the ASOAC's election policies for its chair and co-chair in the Adobe chat room. And so thank you to her for that. Let me - now let me try to do this in 60 seconds. This will be a real test.

                The - one of the things that the address supporting organization does quite clearly in its supporting documents, what they call their organizational documents, is that they provide a description of what the roles of the AC chair and the AC co-chairs are. This is not as extensive as what I hear in the

discussion going around the table. It's not a job description. It's the role. It's what is expected of that person. I can tell you from my own experience in the ASOAC that this statement of roles, even though it's not very long, has been enough to say to some people I'm not cut out to be that person or I could be that person.

Next what the ASO does is provide a very clear statement of eligibility, who is it that can actually be the ASO chair. And then there is an election process and that election process is built out - up out of nominations. The nominations are actually from all of the delegates or all of the members of the address council. That election process even supports a process in which there are ties, there are mechanisms for dealing with that. And then the co-chairs - you'll be alarmed but amused to know, the co-chairs are nominated by the newly elected chair. And the idea behind that historically in the ASO is that the ASO is primarily is a much more homogenous group than the GNSO is in that the ASO primarily is elected out of regional registries. People have a very common, very tightly focused set of interests that are pretty much in common globally.

And so there is a recognition that number one that the shared work from the community can be divided between the chair and the two co-chairs and number two that the chair is a good judge of who those co-chairs should be. And then the third criteria is that there is global diversity among the chair and the co-chairs is the mechanism by which then the ASO comes up with its co-chairs. I know for a fact that wasn't 60 seconds but that was close. I commend you to the page that's actually on the Adobe chat room for more details, but that's the basic idea behind the address council's mechanism for selecting chairs and co-chairs.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Mark. That was very interesting to hear about how others do it. Joan you have your card up. Is that an old one? Okay. But Heather next.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Tapani. The previous commenter perhaps a helpful jump. I recall there were email exchanges that came out of the last intersessional as to how we might move forward in selecting a chair based on - or excuse me, a vice chair based on a rotational process. Avri I think you were the author of a number of those emails. There were many of us that weighed in on it. Could we perhaps revisit that? Let's focus on process and not simply talk today because we actually have spent one intersessional doing exactly that and we're still where we are. And I would like to see that the - that this isn't on the agenda for the next intersessional. So let's go back. Let's talk about what was proposed 12 months ago and let's see if we can't nail that down today. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Heather. I have Greg next.

Greg Shatan: Yes I would support that as well. I think we do need to come out of this with something. We spent most of the year after the last intersessional trying to come up with a vice chair process. We were somehow I think we got close although the back and forth was very slow. And then when we finally had to make the selection, we kind of forgot we even had that - those rules and just scrapped it out for better or worse. So I think we do need a process and if it doesn't work well then we work on revising the process. But the limbo thing just is horrible. And secondly, I think that the job description is also important. I think that the GNSO operating procedures actually have a description that's roughly similar to what was in the ASO's. They really need to get beyond that kind of, you know, helping out the chair kind of thing and acting as the chair when the chair evaporates.

You know, it really gets down to something that kind of it has to work, you know, for this house. It may not be the same for the other house but we need a description that kind of and criteria so that we can make judgments and then hold that chair - that vice chair person accountable to those criteria afterwards so that, you know, the gamesmanship can be kind of stopped if it ever starts and hopefully it won't. But, you know, that I think may be the process for dealing with, you know, lack of trust is to have accountability. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes thank you Greg. Unfortunately I wasn't in the last intersessional and I haven't been able to read all those emails. But if the case is really that it was almost done and then just the final touches of clearing the process were lost then it would be indeed a good idea to try to review that stuff and move collectives that can come up with a process now and fix it without letting it hang on until the next election comes along without having a procedure. Hanging and then try to fight it out in the last minute because that usually does not work out as we've just seen. Okay Lori?

Lori Schulman: I have a question. I was at the last intersessional and I don't recall. Did we at least reach some sort of rough consensus? We didn't or we did? So did we reach some sort of rough consensus that alternating the chair is generally a good idea? Because perhaps that's the starting point. If we in the room today can agree yes it makes sense to alternate the vice - I'm not sorry not the chair, the vice chair. If it alter - it makes sense to alternate the vice chair within our own house. If we can get to that agreement today, we could move forward but if we can't even get there I'm a little stymied even as the moderator where to take the group.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I see that Sam and Marilyn want to speak. Sam first.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. This is me reflecting on my short tenure watching these processes. We wouldn't be have - we would not be having this discussion if it weren't for the issue of trust. So is it possible to follow-up on Heather's comment about terms of reference for what these positions look like, descriptions of positions. Then on vice president or vice chair, chair and so forth, design those on the assumption that we've got terms of reference where the person has to behave the way the person should behave and not simply treat acquiring the position as a power coup. Is there some way to get there so that the appointment guarantees that the trust is going to be there because the terms of reference require that? That's the short question.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Sam. I'm afraid that it's a very good question which means I don't have an answer to it. But I think nothing will guarantee it but we might come with something that makes it more likely to work. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Marilyn Cade. Having been involved over the years including the time when I was on the council, I don't and I was at the intersessional. I did not support. I'm not going to. I think we should look at the report. I did not support the automatic rotation and I believe that others agree with me. But now I want to go to a different point. I'd like us to maybe use a different construct other than the word trust. I think that's missing the point here. We're not in agreement about certain things but if we agree on the job description, the procedures that should be followed, the behaviors that we expect from someone who fills the job description, then we can determine the candidates based on who best can fulfill that description.

                  When we use the word trust, we immediately set up a barrier between each other. I think we just don't have agreement on procedures and processes and if we could. I think we ought to be able as we started out earlier to come up with a here are the characteristics that we think are essential including the

availability of time, the experience and expertise. That doesn't necessarily have to mean you've spent a lot of time on the council than maybe someone who has a lot of expertise in an area, an adjacent area that procedurally could do a very good job. But maybe we could strike using the word trust.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I see Jimson and then Sam. Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. Thank you very much. Well we do need to have a structure. It's very important we have a structure. And we can count on what has happened before. So if we've had a process that as we have seen now that worked maybe in form of alternating representation, well we could consider that. And then have a time limit, a specific time limit, you know, for say a secular group and then have a scope as has been said, a work scope and then a qualification, candidate qualification. What are those things that the candidate should have maybe in terms of experience, number of experience on this issue, familiarity with some topical issues? And then if there is a particular secular endorsement that is very important advantage.

So I think the issue of alternating makes a lot of sense because you know you have finished your time. If you have a time of one year, two years, or three years well I think two years would be just maybe reasonable. But we actually have a starting point. So after the initial base times or structure then we can subject it to a review to maybe in another two years or tense like that. But we should have something and we should fall back to what are some of the things that has worked in time past. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Jimson and Sam Lanfranco?

Sam Lanfranco: Okay very brief and I - to follow up on the comments about trust. I was not thinking of trust in the sense of I trust Individual A and don't trust Individual

B. But in terms of reference, a job description that is basically in terms of reference, it allows us to have trust in the way in which the position is going to be executed.

If it turns out that an individual does that badly or well and partly Jimson's comment about what's their background in terms of that capacity, that's a different issue.

But as it is now, the procedure of getting there is partly what we don't have trust in. And there's - there are no terms of reference for what the position - how it's supposed to be executed. So I - that's - so I'd even pull it back and say robustness around that and not use the other word.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thanks Sam. At this point I know that we were planning to talk besides the Vice Chair selection, also then the Board member selection. So maybe it is about time -- we are about halfway through -- to shift to that and then see if we (had need) to different processes, procedures there or commonalities for the Vice Chair selection.

Would somebody like to open up the - would anybody like to, for example, recall difficulties in the last time we chose a Board member? Avri, it seems you want to say something.

Avri Doria: No. I do not want to recall the difficulties we had last time.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. I guess that tells us that there were difficulties last time. So - okay. Sam would like to comment.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. I'm commenting before I had a chance to do my little quick review online here. But as the second or third person that was road kill on that path

for the last one - for the last Board appointment of - and I'm not unhappy as I was road kill.

What I was unhappy about was when I was standing in the middle of the road waiting for the car to come, some of the procedures that were supposed to be followed referred to content in the ICANN bylaws that simply wasn't there.

I mean it's - I was going to try to find the Appendix A that doesn't exist that was supposed to give guidance at that point in time where there was no Appendix A.

So what I was perplexed with about that part was not whether or not I was going to be run over. That was pretty clear I was going to be run over. But what I didn't understand was what happened - how this organization had existed as long as it did without somebody saying hey, if you're going to refer to a procedure, where's the procedure.

So that's my only comment. And I'll try and find Appendix - the, you know, the placeholder for Appendix A so I can footnote what I'm talking about.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Sam. Jimson, is your card up or did you forget it's up? Okay. So the situation with the Board selection is a bit different than in terms of Vice Chairs because it's usually I think not someone representing either stakeholder group here. But could be somebody - more likely to be someone (outside). Okay.

Is there anybody want to comment on how we could do that? Or perhaps as a way of moving forward, I think we might set up a small working group like a couple of people of both stakeholder groups to come back and make - collect these ideas and make up a concrete proposal. Does not seem useful to go into

too much detail in this big group now. Okay. Lori wants to disagree on that, so.

Lori Schulman: I just - I disagree on that point. I think it makes perfect sense to go into detail. I mean this to me what makes the intersessional different is that we do have the time to sit here for 20 minutes maybe and brainstorm on the Board.

Marilyn's already mentioned two qualities. They have to have time, be available and they have to have demonstrated at least on the Vice Chair side some ability to lead a workgroup or some other large group within ICANN to some solution hopefully. So right there we've named two criteria. We've started the process.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Lori. Of course if we want to talk about them, it would be perfectly fine. And we might actually go on with collecting a list of ideas and criteria we want to have and so forth and write them up. Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: I hope that you got the hint about 20 minutes ago when I put the white board behind you. And there are three pens in different colors and there is a strong person beside who just do it.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Lori has just volunteered to write them up on the white board. So...

Lori Schulman: I'm doing it in red.

Tapani Tarvainen: ...so anybody - what do we want to write up?

Lori Schulman: On the Vice Chair.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. The Vice Chair. Qualities we want from the Vice Chair.

Lori Schulman: Time.

Marilyn Cade: I think - actually I think I would say experience and expertise in leading - it
doesn't have to be within the Council but I think it has to be...

Greg Shatan: That's what I mean...

Marilyn Cade: ...just somebody who's - like if you submit a job description, you're able to say
I've led a group of - diverse group of similar characteristics, et cetera.

Greg Shatan: I'd say a commitment to being even handed between - in representing the two
Houses. I don't know if that one - you seem to not see my card. I know it's
very far away here.

Marilyn Cade: And Lori, I have - and it's Marilyn. I have one more. I think we would have to
agree that the constituencies are agreeing that this position is - has to be even
handed.

Tapani Tarvainen: Absolute - yes. Absolutely. Even handed, that is critical.

Marilyn Cade: So we're saying the individual has to be even handed. But I think we actually
have to ask the constituencies to commit to support the goal of
evenhandedness.

Tapani Tarvainen: That sounds like a good idea to have it (and that's why we want). Of course
we also need to have someone that their constituencies trust to be even handed
but if I (committed) to that to begin with, it should help. Other ideas? Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Just simply experience in ICANN as a whole structure because in the GNSO basically a lot of stuff comes together, which it's sometimes good to know what the Business Constituency is actually up to even if you are not in it.

And I think just some general experience and of course I can't read it from here because of my eyesight. I don't know if it's up there but just simply the ability to - and experience to chair diverse groups. It's - I guess it's on there. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Others? Maybe I would call upon Heather at this point to comment on this list of qualities and say if you - how do they fit to you and what else you have that would be useful in this position to add to this list.

Heather Forrest: Gee thanks Tapani. As a general comment, what I would like to say is that in doing this good work, let's then ensure that these criteria - and I'll be bold and say only these criteria or mainly these criteria are used in the next Vice Chair process.

Let's not have some sort of secret outside thing that we're not willing to articulate on this list. Let's be evaluated transparently in the spirit of ICANN's own transparency requirement.

So in drafting this list, if you're not willing to articulate it publicly here, then it shouldn't be used in this process. No more candidates being rejected for reasons that they don't understand, that they don't have a grasp of. That's my general statement.

I certainly think that the time commitment is important. That relates to the Chair and the Vice Chair. Following up on Greg's comment about willingness to deal even handedly or I forget what the exact words were.

That needs to be demonstrated ability to deal even handedly. So there needs to be some sort of concrete evidence of, you know, in the ICANN environment I did this and there were conflicting views and I had a personal view and I held that back or something like that.

Not just some fuzzy commitment too because it's very, very easy. We see it every election in the ICANN environment, not just within the GNSO or within the Non-Contracted Parties House. Everyone stands up and says of course I can deal even handedly. I'm not biased. It's very easy to say and it's much harder to live. So let's see something concrete come from that.

Interaction with the ICANN community as a broad - as a whole. One thing that I - I'll add that to the list. One thing that I've noticed just now in two months or so as Vice Chair is that that role has an interact ability component to it that we have to be able to interact with leaders of the ccNSO and leaders of the GAC and this sort of thing.

And having existing networks and relationships and knowledge of those other communities within the GNSO and not - or within ICANN and not simply the GNSO I think is quite important to the extent that you have those sort of networks and contacts.

It facilitates the role, which means, you know, a brand new newcomer to ICANN and to our environment I don't think would function as effectively in the sort of self-diplomacy that has to go on in the background and that sort of thing.

Other things that I've noticed in the last two months; obviously - I mean it sounds basic but obviously an ability to work well with others. Ability to work

collaboratively. I think that's certainly important as we expand the scope of the role of GNSO leadership or we sort of redefine the role of GNSO leadership.

We're now doing things very much as three parties within the GNSO leadership and communications go to the two Vice Chairs and the Chair. And we discuss things as a group. Before Council meetings we prepare for each Council meeting.

And certainly if you weren't able to work effectively within that small group, it would make things quite unworkable in the broader group. I'll think of it further Tapani but hopefully that'll throw something in the meantime. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Heather. I might point at this point one quality you haven't mentioned is the ability to react when somebody asks you to speak without warning and you have that. Good. I have Klaus and Maria in the queue.

Klaus Stoll: Oh Jimson, come on.

Tapani Tarvainen: Jimson, were you first? Okay.

Klaus Stoll: Were you first?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Jimson, go.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you. Just a quick follow up to Heather's comment. Would they need to substantiate the idea of experience? So maybe that could be a provision that it should have been at least in the NCPH for at least two years

or three years. Excuse me. That will give a measure to the level of experience in the - within ICANN.

And two, there is also need to provide every days that the entity the person is representing will also support that person to be - to run for that office (because) to avoid a situation whereby somebody's who elected he has the time commitment and these - the entities representing just takes him off that (truck).

And lastly, I don't know if the issue of a language or comment is necessary like the UN languages, the person needs to able to express himself in any of the four or five clear languages. I don't know, so.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you.

Lori Schulman: Are you saying multilingual? Is that what I heard you say. That the Chair should be multilingual?

Jimson Olufuye: Please come again.

Lori Schulman: Did you say that the - that one of the qualities that they speak more than one language?

Jimson Olufuye: No, no, no. The quality is that they should be able to express at least in just one UN language - with one UN language.

Lori Schulman: Okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Yes. I guess that's speaking, for example, only Finish would be a rather bad quality, yes. But in the queue I have...

Klaus Stoll: Tapani, I think I was next.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. I think actually we pretty much have to - well, but...

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: ...but at least one. Anyway but I have Maria, Klaus and Tony Harris in order
                  next, so. Klaus before you? Okay. Klaus go first. Okay.

Klaus Stoll: Okay. Maybe I'm getting too fast so it's absolutely a stupid idea. But I just
                  realized if we - let's say we have a list of ten criteria. It's extremely useful for
                  everybody involved to give each criteria one to ten points. Let's say they're -
                  each criteria gets ten points.

                  The person who wants - everybody involved can really transparently self-
                  evaluate - a candidate can self-evaluate himself and can say, for example,
                  okay, I'm scoring (it could send the thing) over 50 points. But I don't score at
                  one or two.

                  The same thing can be done in the constituency level and other level. So I find
                  it extremely useful and objective to really combine the list with a point system
                  and that doesn't need to be made officially or binding. It just can guide us a
                  little bit into the right direction.

Klaus Stoll: Okay. So some kind of self-evaluation list. But Maria.

Maria Farrell: Thank you Tapani. Maria speaking. Well, I actually quite like the exercise that
                  we're doing here and the points that were mentioned by Heather.

My only concern is that when I look at this list, I still find it highly subjective. And looking back at the election that we had, I remember conversations with colleagues and we were kind of intending to vote for different people and we would go over the list and we would both argue that the person is better at this. No, no. But my candidate is better in this.

So it's really hard when you're having a real conversation and analyzing people because a lot of what we're looking at here is really self-declaratory. Okay. I declare that I have time. I declare that I will act like this or like that.

But it would be interesting and I agree with Klaus, if we had some system in which we can translate this into kind of more objective criteria, I think that this would help us.

And my only doubt with regards to not following the rotation between the Houses, what would happen if we had like three, four candidates? Do you see a complication? I see it in the sense that when I look at this list the more candidates we have because it is just subjective and the harder it would be to make a decision.

So I think that the rotation gives us some structure. But I know that we are going back to a previous point. Maybe we don't have time to discuss the rotation. But I do think this is a good idea to keep.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Maria. I pointed to actually this - having this kind of a criteria at least is not necessary and contradictory that rotation scheme. Even with the rotation scheme that could be something that could be used in argument to persuade the others, take a look if this is a good okay candidate. But next Tony and then...

Tony Holmes: Yes. Thanks. It's Tony Holmes. I'd like to speak to Tony Harris but he isn't here. Just comment. And it builds on something Maria said was well. That I don't know whether this exercise is moving forward as a basis of good will or frustration or a real benefit of having an interesessional.

But I look at the list that's actually being compiled and I would argue that some of the candidates that haven't proved acceptable on either side in the past could actually meet that criteria.

So the subjectivity of this is absolutely crucial. I'm not sure this gets us out of the way we were before unless there's a change in thinking and more good will within the group because for me I could even look at people that I've struggled with and say they actually meet that pretty well.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. That's a very good point. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan. I think a list like this is actually very supportive of the rotation system. And I think it helps the organization - the stakeholder group that has the seat presumptively in the rotation to make internal choices better and to defend its choices if needed to the other organization - to the other stakeholder group.

And it allows the stakeholder group that's looking at that choice and, you know, if we decide that that involves exercising, you know, some form of yea or nay or extraordinary veto that, you know, if the other House or the other side of the House had to make a choice they could make it on those criteria.

I don't think we can avoid a level of subjectivity but at the same time I think it at least allows us to express it within a rubric rather than just saying, you

know, I don't like it or I have this unexpressed problem or this, you know, dislike. I think we at least need to translate it.

So I view this criteria program as being consistent with a rotation system. And I, you know, I am generally in favor of a rotation system. I think it's fair. And I think, you know, with the - obviously if we are ever so lucky as to have a Chair from one of the two stakeholder groups as such and not, you know, you know, while they're sitting as the NCA.

Then we would have to deal with - it would be, you know, upset but that's the educate. It's the main case here as I think, you know, flipping it back and forth but with defined criteria and an ability to point at those criteria as being met or not.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Greg. That's actually much as my thinking here as well that having a rotation scheme and using this criteria and not just something that we can define objectively or going but something that we have to show that - argue about. Go through the list and say that I (unintelligible) candidate is good because of this - fits this criteria.

And if you reject them, actually point out to some of this criteria and this is why we don't like him. So that would work. Any others? Susan.

Susan Payne: Just another one for the list I suppose. I don't think it's necessary or I don't think it's even possible to be certain that the candidate would be trusted by the Contracted Parties House.

But I think it would be important to be able to be confident that they're not positively distrusted because it goes back to the collaboration point. So I think

some means of assessing whether there are - there's demonstrable evidence of them being distrusted.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Susan. It seems that Farzaneh wants to speak.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. I have a question about speak at least one UN language. One UN language other than English or what are you - what do you mean by one UN language?

Greg Shatan: That disqualifies all the Americans.

Farzaneh Badii: I know. But the thing is that most of us - I mean I think all of us here communicate in English. So do you mean that they be fluent in another language other than English or...

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. I think we pretty much have to in practice unlikely to select someone who doesn't speak English and while it could be useful to speak other languages, I don't see that it would be a very heavy criteria because not many people speak fluently more than one.

Susan Payne: Also perhaps gender diversity maybe - or did I raise a very sensitive issue here?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. That would be something to consider in the long-term but I don't think we could set an absolute rule here. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Tapani. On that point, I do think that in developing the set of criteria, just thinking about diversity more generally, there are very many things which very many of us object to in that report on the GNSO review. And I understand that that's a topic for another time in the day.

However, there are some very constructive recommendations in the GNSO review on diversity and what that means. Some of that can be internalized within our stakeholder groups and constituencies so maybe that's where that work happens.

But I think in reviewing this list of criteria we ought to think about the fact that the GNSO review report quite plainly says we are not - we as the GNSO and the Council, we're not exactly a representative group, representative meaning of the World Internet unit. So we ought to at least bear that in mind and perhaps reflect that - somehow capture it in one of these criteria. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Heather. I have Kiran.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi. I guess I don't really understand what you mean by gender diversity can't be considered or shouldn't be. I think it absolutely should be and it needs to be.

I'm not saying that it's an absolute requirement that the person has to be a woman but I see no problem with this organization encouraging that gender diversity should be a - I guess like a - maybe if you're doing a point system that like a woman would get, you know, extra points just like somebody with a second language might because the Board diversity is hugely problematic and not at all representative of the community that they're - they purport to represent. So I think gender diversity absolutely has to be on there.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I don't think anybody has said it should not be a criteria at all; not an absolute criteria. But definitely I would be happy to have a rule that we - in

the long-term have to have equal in gender representation like that in every four, five, whatever in turn would be - have to be women or even alternating.

I don't see that as a big problem but - or point system. I'm happy to have that as one criteria there among others at least. I'm not sure about the list - how people feel about this. Any other comments? Greg.

Greg Shatan: Let's remember that we're selecting from a pool of basically six people each time. So we may or may not have, you know, a lot of gender diversity at the moment. So I think that, you know, while it's definitely worth encouraging and I'll note that both Vice Chairs of the GNSO Council are women and those originating at least from the global (South).

So, you know, that's all good. But there may be different people that have different times. I was going to make a remark about being hooked into a gender binary issue here and that we should - but I don't think we need to go there.

I think because we're choosing from such a small pool while definitely there is, you know, we should keep an eye on this and not just kind of, you know, make it repetitive. It really has to - it can't kind of influence too strongly because we're just - if we're choosing from a pool of 500 people, then it would be different.

But we're choosing from six or maybe even five or four depending upon who's coming on and off the Council. So I think there are just dangers in getting, you know, hooked up in this too deeply.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Greg. Actually that's basically what I was trying to say that we cannot make it an absolute criteria because we are too small pool but

definitely giving that one consideration. Any other comments here? Shall we take a quick look at the list we've complied? See if something's missing. I guess everybody can't see that. So Lori, would you read them out?

Lori Schulman: I can read it. Can you hear me? Time. That the person has time and they're available. That they have demonstrated leadership and expertise with leading either by working group or some other large organization.

That there's a commitment to evenhandedness. That the constituencies themselves commit to support the even handed approach. That there's experience in ICANN. That there's evidence of an even approach in the past. In other words, you can't just say you're balanced. You have to demonstrate times when you've act as a leader in a balanced way.

Interaction with other SO/ACs and what other processes and exercises have you been in within the ICANN world where you have had to interact beyond our own GNSO.

Demonstrated diplomacy. Collaborative. Perhaps put some sort of timeframe around how long you must be part of the NCPH. Jimson I believe suggested two years. Neutrality.

That we speak at least one UN language and I think the presumption would be English as ICANN business is primarily conducted in English but it doesn't have to be.

Some notes here that it would be important to weight the criteria. Have the candidate do a self-analysis as well as have the stakeholder groups be able to weight by these criteria.

And we're challenged. You know, how do we create an objective way of establishing the criteria? How do we just transcend their own subjectivity? The comment was made that even having this list, the list itself would still support having a rotation.

And there seems - there is a split in the room between those who favor rotation and those who don't. We could use this criteria to create a rubric. And absolutely there should be a goal toward diversity but perhaps not an absolute quota for lack of a better word.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Lori. I see that Heather wants to comment on that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much. Lori, back to the comment about subjective/objectivity and the one that you read about time; I think that's the first one. I think I'm going to throw out some ICANN language here.

Some sort of statement of non-support or objection from the person's employer would perhaps make that a more objective criterion rather than just I have time.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Heather. And next I have - yes, Chris.

Chris Wilson: Thank you. Chris Wilson. And I'm coming at this from - obviously a very different perspective since I have no institutional memory of - and maybe that's a blessing.

But my thought was in piggybacking I guess on what Greg noted in terms of the small pool of candidates. You know, all these criteria and discussion really I mean I think are even better focused on the selection of each stakeholder group's GNSO Council (unintelligible) him or herself.

So you create presumably a better pool of candidates when it is time to choose the Vice Chairs. And I don't, you know, each stakeholder group's got their own approach I guess to doing that. But I think, you know, that the farther down the ladder you start these thinking, I think the better off we'll be.

So when we do get to the point where we have - ideally we have - we'd have four, five, six candidates who are all fantastic because we all spent the hard work getting to that point in the first place. So I just - an observational point of view from someone who hasn't been too involved in it up to this point.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Chris. At this point, okay, Tony Holmes.

Tony Holmes: Just a quick question. Is someone going to capture this and make sure we use it going forward from this meeting? How's that going to happen?

Tapani Tarvainen: Well that's one reason why Lori's writing those on the white board so we will try to type it up cleanly and put it on the mailing list or something for discussion somewhere.

But I note we have a - running out of time and we want to talk about Board member election and I note Markus Kummer has just arrived among us. Maybe should do the same list for the Board member or maybe look at this list in terms if it would work for that as well.

Lori Schulman: I want to follow up on Tony's point. I think while it is important to spend a little bit of time on the Board, I think it may be more critical at this moment to make an agreement of how we would operationalize what we've talked about, which is I think basically what you're asking.

I will volunteer to photograph this and write them up and send them to this group. I'll do it. I will do it though not immediately. I will do it in ten days. I will tell you when. Because I do think you can do this list and then we can walk away and a year from now somebody's going to say wasn't there a list like - we said from last year did not we have a proposal. Didn't somebody have a proposal?

So I think a critical decision that I'd like to see this room make now is what do we do next. How are we going to operationalize what we've just talked about?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Lori. I see Matthew and then Greg.

Greg Shatan: I'm going to...

Matthew Shears: Matthew Shears. I think the list is a good one. I think there's one issue that's missing on there, which is the issue of the person's commitment or proven ability to work in a transparent and open manner.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. Greg.

Greg Shatan: I think with a Board member we also need to make reference to that criteria that are put forward by the NomCom. They've, you know, indicated, you know, basically kind of a wish list of criteria such as, you know, financial, government governance experience and the like as well - I'm not going to rattle it off. I don't have it memorized.

But I think we need to kind of, you know, make reference back to that as well. And I, you know, think that, you know, as the Board itself matures they're, you know, looking for people with some stronger criteria. So we should definitely, you know, make reference to those criteria and our own choices.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Greg. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to ask Chantelle if perhaps she might volunteer to do the first cut at the drafting again so that we can then talk about it more while we're here. I think I'm sure in a nanosecond since I'm experienced now with your excellent work that after lunch we would probably see that list.

Lori Schulman: Great idea. I forgot we have the magical Chantelle. That's right.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. But any other additions here? Actually I would like to have Markus Kummer comment a little on this especially in view of the Board members election, which you have some experience about.

Markus Kummer: Yes. Thank you. And good morning. Hi to you all. It's (blessed) for me to be here. No, I mean I'm painfully aware about the inadequacy of the Board in terms of diversity either gender or geographical diversity. And we definitely need more of that.

And in terms of competencies, I think the Board has also looked at that to have a more structured onboarding program for new member. And there are some courses on the way to fill gaps in experience and competence. But these comments are definitely well taken.

And the (unintelligible) have to look also at the history. It has a history - the Board to begin with was very much supplementing staff. Staff was so (unintelligible). So - do I not - closer to the microphone. Sorry. (Unintelligible). Okay. My apologies.

Well, briefly to repeat. Yes, these comments are well taken. We have to improve the diversity both in terms of gender and geographical diversity. And we also have to look at the competencies and time and commitment people are willing to give to the ICANN position.

But I was saying this has a history. And to begin with, the Board was here to take on almost staff functions, as staff was so little. And it has been dragged down into an operational role, which is not really the role of the Board.

And it has proven difficult to get out of that. And we had a discussion just in Singapore on how to make the Board more efficient. And there seems to be a growing awareness and consensus that we really should take a step back and level up a bit on a more strategic level and move out of the operational level.

But it's not that easy. It's easier to be - to say so and it's more difficult to conflate it into action. And the Board I think has a strong analytical ability but it is not that good at implementing and making changes on the basis of the analysis.

But it is a continuous process and we definitely need to look on how to strengthen the Board and hopefully bring in also more diversity in the long-term.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Markus. I see that Greg you have your card up. No. Matthew. No. Just forgetting your cards up. Okay. Would somebody care to comment if the list was just compile for the Vice Chair would actually work as such for the Board member as well? Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I would say no and for some of the reasons that were just mentioned. So for the transcript it's Marilyn Cade. I do think we must pull out those criteria that

are in the - the Nominating Committee criteria are the kinds of general criteria that we really need in the Board particularly because the Board has fiduciary responsibilities that the Vice Chair doesn't have or the Chair of the Council doesn't have.

They have legal liabilities and obligations. So, you know, I think - and now I'm looking at Lars. Maybe clipping out the criteria and posting it to the list. Though the criteria from the Nominating Committee that includes the, I don't know, persons of good repute and you're not under investigation by Interpol and - I'm joking.

But there is - there's actual criteria that we could then build on. And then - but also the Board seat from this House is going - is expected to represent the interest of the House. Nominating Committee appointees are expected to be more generally supported. So I do think we should talk about adding - building on the criteria that is available - that is available as a resource.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Marilyn. I definitely agree that these are not sufficient criteria for the Board. But perhaps like to clarify there's something in this criteria we picked up for the Vice Chair that would not be useful or relevant at all to the Board.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. It's Marilyn. I don't think the Board member is responsible for managing the House, et cetera. They have different responsibilities.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Of course. We did not specify this but rather generic criteria (we said). Do we want to and we don't have all that much time left. So unless someone has other comments, here I think the way to move forward first we - (Chantelle) with her magic will compile this list in a form we can circulate and build on.

And then perhaps we should actually form a small working group team to try to come up with this - clean this up so to speak as a proposal we could use in the future. Would that work? Would anybody be volunteering for such a task? No. Any other suggestion how we more forward.

Lori Schulman: (I'll volunteer).

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Lori is a volunteer. At least starting to draft his in a more concrete form that we can use. Susan. I take Susan is volunteering as well. Okay. (Rob), you want to (kind of say something)?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. Thank you for recognizing that I was not volunteering. I may end up being volunteered. I would note that it doesn't have to be somebody from around this table. So each of you as Chairs of your individual communities could take the obligation to pull someone from your communities to participate in this. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you (Rob). Okay. I think nobody seems to object to this process so we start with Susan and Lori and we'll try to adopt at least a small group just basically to make this clean - write this up in a clean fashion so (as to) see if we can come up with a proposal that works for everybody.

Any other comments on this subject? Nobody wants to speak. Are we running out of things to speak with three minutes to go? Can't be right. Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes. I'll editorialize. I think this session started slow but I think we've come to a really great point and I'm just looking forward to keeping it going.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Lori. And Avri, you want to say something?

Avri Doria: I want to ask a question. Okay. We got a bunch of criteria. But have we moved it all or do we know how we're going to move on processes?

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm afraid not much. But Lori.

Lori Schulman: I think there is a last one area that's sort of any other business. And maybe we defer some of that to the any other business when (Chantelle) circulates the list and we can really read it and think about it, go back to our stakeholder - I mean go back to our constituencies even within our own stakeholder groups today. And then I would ask (Rob) to reserve some time in that last plenary any other business to talk about process.

Tapani Tarvainen: That sounds like a good idea to me. So we try to get - discuss this within our smaller groups and then come back to this tomorrow. Okay. So one minute to go. And I will - unless nobody else wants to say anything, let's call this meeting done. Thank you everybody. Okay Lori.

Lori Schulman: I was going to say one minute bathroom break because we haven't officially gotten one.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. We'll have - let's close this session and we have one minute left over. Perfect timing. Thank you everybody.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Tapani and Lori, I have shared with my fellow staff the potential mutiny that would occur, if we didn't recognize some form of a break as we move into the Lunch session, we will keep the same timing, but we are changing some of the logistics here in terms of remote participation of some of our speakers to say lets start the next session officially with our speakers in the next 20 minutes. Lunch is outside; generally you are welcome to eat right

here at the table, and that might work, but please feel free to mix, mingle outside and we will convene promptly at 20 minutes after the start of this session at 12:50. Thank you.

END