ICANN Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Wednesday 31 May 2017 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on the Wednesday, 31 May 2017 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ssc-31may17-en.mp3 AND

https://participate.icann.org/p77493uq9d7/

Attendees:
Maxim Alzoba
Julf Helsingius
Osvaldo Novoa
Lori Schulman
Renate Ribeira Aquino
Susan Kawaguchi
James Bladel

Apologies:
Frederic Guillemaut
Marika Konings (staff)

ICANN staff:
Emily Barabas
Michelle DeSmyter

Coordinator: Excuse me, recordings are started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thanks, (Rochelle). Well good morning, good afternoon and good

                      evening to all. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on

                      the 31st of May at 1400 UTC. On the call today we have Maxim Alzoba, Julf

Helsingius – I'm sorry, Susan Kawaguchi, James Bladel and Lori Schulman. We have apologies from Frédéric Guillemaut and Marika Konings from staff. And from staff we do have Emily Barabas and myself, Michelle DeSmyter online.

As a reminder to all, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And I would like to turn the call back over to Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks very much, Michelle. And good morning all and thank you all for being on the call. We've invited James this morning to give us his impression and experience with being the EC rep which might help guide our developing criteria for this role. So James, can you just give us some insight on what you've done so far and what you think the role might be required to do?

James Bladel: Thanks, Susan. And good morning everyone. Thanks for inviting me. So my experiences with be empowered community administration are limited and brief but I'll give you as much as I can.

For quite a while – and first I should point out that because this committee has yet to define the criteria and make a selection I have been the interim representative; I've been appointed by a motion of the GNSO Council. But, you know, at the time we always envisioned that there would be a permanent representative from the GNSO coming from this committee.

I just point that out because every time, you know, it comes up in discussions on the empowered community I try to remind them that I and the interim appointee and so forth.

But in any case, the empowered community administration was fairly quiet for quite some time. It is sort of (dealing) itself out in terms of figuring out what its processes look like an what, you know, how it should operate particularly for things that are going to be routine like reviewing the budget or appointing

folks that are nominated by one of the SOs or ACs to the ICANN Board of Directors.

Those things are not necessarily emergency events but they are – but they are, you know, defined in the bylaws and in the articles of incorporation as something that the empowered community has a role to either approve or reject. And so that's something that we are trying to define first off is how do we handle these recurring routine functions.

And then of course there is –there are the bigger functions that are envisioned as part of the new accountability mechanism, so for example if the empowered community wanted to initiate a review of the – of an ICANN Board decision or fire, remove, sorry, recall a director or spill the entire Board or reject the ICANN budget and fall back to the caretaker budget, all those big levers of power are available to be empowered community but not necessarily envisioned that they would be used regularly if at all, they are just kind of there as a safeguard.

Most of the participants are the chairs or whatever designation is for each SO and AC, I think it's chair for all of them. And all of us have agreed that we are just stand in support representatives or, you know, a mouthpiece if you will, for our community and that none of us have the ability to act on behalf of our community or bind our community to decisions except and unless those communities have instructed us to do so or have taken some formal process to instruct their representative to take a particular decision or respond or vote a certain way or etcetera.

And this came up I think interesting way most recently when, and I don't know if you're aware, we – and the GNSO – nominated Matthew Shears to become the Non-Contracted Party House Board of Directors. And that posed the question of well, okay, so the GNSO nominates and the empowered community appoints, or designates them to the Board. Does that mean that

the ALAC and the GAC and the ccNSO and all the other groups then go back and vote on our nominee?

And that raised an interesting sort of discussion. And I think correctly the group decided no, that as long as the internal procedures for each SO and AC were followed that the empowered community did not have the right to kind of review or veto or whatever the Board nominee running out of a different community.

So it's kind of those sorts of processes that we are figuring out as we go, and noting that this is an organization that is in its infancy and is moving very slowly and deliberately to keep itself in mind that it, you know, it's creating precedent that might reverberate for years.

And then just finally I think to Susan, your last question, what sort of a person or what qualifications would be required, I think some, you know, I think first and foremost you want someone who understands the role and that their role is not to be a member or participant in some sort of uber-Council or super-Board or whatever, you know, whatever misconceptions of folks might have about what the empowered community actually is and does, that they are speaking on behalf of the entire GNSO community.

And if the entire GNSO community has not authorized them to speak on a particular subject then they don't; they don't speak, they don't vote because, you know, they are – in a way they are representing or, you know, representing the wishes or the sentiments of that community and should follow that.

I think it is someone who – at this stage in the game someone who is thinking down the road that, you know, if we create a process now that, you know, how are we going to feel if we are shackled to it, you know, 5, 10 years from now, if we can even conceive of that. And, you know, I think someone who gets along well with these kinds of Byzantine processes.

I think if you want to cut through the red tape and get to the outcome or if you've got a score to settle against, let's say a, you know, ICANN the organization or the CEO or somebody like that, then this is probably not necessarily a good sign that someone will be comfortable operating as a representative in the empowered community.

I think it is very much a participation in a very abstract construct that is a big responsibility, and I think needs to be approached carefully and need to be recognizing when, you know, look, you know, the GNSO hasn't really considered this issue. I can't speak to it. I can't participate in this discussion. I can't cast a vote. I'm going to have to go back to the community and report this.

Because I think that is going to be probably the most common response or all communities when something is brought before the empowered community that wasn't socialized across the entirety of ICANN.

So I don't know if that's helpful. Like I said, it is still – we are still kind of trying to paint the path forward. But it is, I hope more than anything it's clear what this is and what it isn't. And then maybe that helps you formulate an idea of what sort of criteria you would choose to judge applicants.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, James. That's quite a bit of information and good to get your insight since you are filling the role right now. I have a few questions but it looks like Emily and Julf have questions. So, Emily, do you want to go first?

Emily Barabas: Sure. I was just going to raise the – this is Emily Barabas from staff. I was just going to raise the question that came up on an earlier call about time commitment for the role. And I know James, you said that, you know, because its early days still there's a lot of process development happening. But is there any sense that you have about how much of a time commitment

this is going to be and what that might mean for the selection process that the SSC is going through? Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks Emily. So time commitment at first was zero and then I think it's picked up fairly significantly as we approach the meeting in Johannesburg, and primarily because we are going to be reviewing a change to the bylaws, which I think everyone is aware of. That has to go through the empowered community so prepping for that. And then these – defining some of these processes that are going to be used on a recurring basis like selection of Board members.

So it's picked up quite a bit but I suspect that once all of those processes are defined it will drop, you know, the time commitment will drop down again once this is stood up.

That even, you know, even as a worst-case I would not say that this is a fairly significant burden. You know, I mean, if it's an hour or two a week that would probably be pretty extreme. I think it's more important that someone who's involved, and particularly since I'm a member of the GNSO I would say, you know, anyone coming from the GNSO should have perfect attendance.

So it's not so much that it's an hour a week or an hour a month, but if it is an hour month, you know, it's important that the representative for the GNSO not be absent for that hour. So it's more about a reliability I think than an overall time commitment.

Susan Kawaguchi: So within that time commitment, is that mainly emails or phone calls?

James Bladel: Yes, it's almost entirely participating on email mailing list. There was one phone call. And I think when we get to the ICANN meeting in Johannesburg there will be one session.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So this role could expect to – or the EC meets one time during each meeting do you think or…?

James Bladel: No, I don't think it's necessary for the EC to meet every meeting. I think that they are meeting – sorry – they're meeting in Johannesburg because there is a proposed revision to the bylaws. But if that were not on the table I don't think that they would be looking for a session in Joberg.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

James Bladel: I think you could conceivably go an entire year or even longer without the empowered community administration convening.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And before I move forward with a couple more questions I have, does anybody else have questions for James? I noted, Julf, that you were asking – going to ask the same question as Emily. Okay and Maxim is typing. So maybe I'll ask a question before.

So you had said that right now all of the EC reps were the chairs of their communities. So do you – did you get the impression that that would continue with the other SOs and ACs or were they defining processes to select a rep for this role?

James Bladel: That's a good question. I didn't get the impression that they were defining any selection processes. That doesn't mean that they aren't doing so but I presume that because none of them are referring to themselves as interim appointees that they have considered this to be a function of the chair of that particular SO or AC, and part of that job description, if you will, is to do this and so they just kind of bolt of this roll onto that role. Because it is possible that there may be something going on but they are not volunteering that at that EC discussion.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And then – my cat is doing funny things and distracting me here. Not sure what she's doing over there. Sorry about that. And then the other question I had was when you suggested that this person would need perfect attendance, wouldn't that suggest that we should put an alternate process or also select an alternate, someone who can fill in if, you know, because eventually somebody – whoever fills this role something – life always happens so we, you know, they may not be able to make a meeting.

Or do you feel like because the work is mainly on the mailing list that it is, you know, someone could pick up for that person via the mailing list or that person, you know, because there's not a specific timeframe and meetings for the most part, do we need an alternate?

James Bladel: Yes that's a good question. And so my thinking is that because it's mostly on the mailing list and because the calls, when they do happen, are usually, you know, conducted via Doodle poll that, you know, it is something that you probably not have a standing alternate for as long as the GNSO process has some mechanism for the representative, you know, like you said, I mean, maybe you're walking out the door to get into your taxi to go to an ICANN meeting and falling rate your ankle or something and you end up you're in the hospital.

Instead, even then you could probably participate remotely but I guess in that situation it might be good to have some sort of a mechanism to designate an ad hoc alternate. I don't know if you need a standing alternate. I think more something that you might consider more importantly than that would be just kind of the processes on, you know, what happens if this person changes jobs and leaves ICANN or somehow becomes unqualified or does something that the GNSO says hey wait a second, we didn't tell you to order sandwiches for the empowered community; what are you thinking?

You know, I think that might be – how do you course correct a representative that going off the reservation might be – and maybe that's not part of the

Selection Committee criteria, maybe that's something more for the GNSO proper. But it's just something to think about I think probably as higher priority than a standing alternate.

I think as long as there is a mechanism to designate and say, you know, I broke my ankle on the way to the airport and, you know, this person is going to represent the GNSO and then have a mechanism on the GNSO that ratifies that, you know, quickly or gives that power to like let's say that chair and vice chairs of the GNSO to quickly approve an alternate or something like that. Something like that might cover you in those situations.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: That's a good idea.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: And then you had mentioned, you know, install and sort of went rogue and did, you know, ordered those sandwiches when I was not approved, do you feel like, I mean, if it was a current GNSO Council member whether it be part of the leadership team or just the general Council, would there, you know, I think that there could be sort of immediate correction, if the criteria allows for a former, you know, Council member who is no longer on the Council, do you feel like that would be – would we have less control there or does it really matter? Either way we could just remove the person from the role.

James Bladel: Yes, I think either way you can just, yes.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And it looks like Maxim has a question.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think we might need the procedure of removal of the person, for example, when GNSO Council would realize that the person did something wrong, extremely wrong. So they notify that this person no more can represent GNSO. And the procedure of fast selection of the new candidate starts. So I suggest we, yes, at least mention development of procedures for removal and for fast insertion of the new person. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: And that's a good suggestion, Maxim, so we can add that to our list of to-dos for this role.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Just a thought, sorry. Jane speaking again. Just as a thought, I think some of this is probably more I think appropriately taken up by the GNSO Council and by the folks who are working to implement the GNSO Council's procedures and align them with the new bylaws. I think the Selection Committee should view its role I think fairly narrowly which is defining a criteria and then putting out a call for applicants and then, you know, evaluating the applicants and then, you know, sending those to the Council for adoption.

I think procedures to control how the GNSO representative represents the GNSO and procedures to kind of yank back on the leash if they go too far like they're running out into the street a little bit, I think those things probably – just in my opinion but those things start to go beyond what the SSC is supposed to do and starts to fall back into the lap of the Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And, Maxim, did you have a…?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, it's clarifying question. If we just mention that such procedures could be developed for the better time and etcetera, without saying how and by whom, is it better this way?

Susan Kawaguchi: James, you have the floor.

James Bladel: Yes, thank you, yes, absolutely, Maxim, agree that, you know, if the SSC identifies something like that where there is a gap that they should put that to-do item on the GNSO list and say look, we discovered there's this hole here, and you need to develop a process to fill it to cover us in this situation. And, you know, set us up for the potential that we will have to reselect a new member.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay so we can just create a list of to-dos or things to think about and we don't need more work really for this committee. So that would simplify our work a little bit. Alright, are there any other questions for James? Any other input, James? What would you like to see in the criteria? Cheating a little bit.

James Bladel: Well, you know, if I can – if I'm free to speak, I feel like this should be at minimum should be someone that is on Council and potentially one of the chairs or vice chairs may be on a rotating basis. Just the reason I say that is because I'm concerned that – I'm concerned that if we throw this open probably, A, it becomes more difficult for the GNSO to, you know, directly manage the representative who is, you know, presumably on a very short leash, right? And, B, it means we have to duplicate or create redundancies like rotation and recall and election and term limits and all the things that currently exist for chairs, vice chairs and councilors.

                 And it also I think if we were to open it up wider, starts to feed this, I believe, incorrect assumption that the empowered community is like a review team are like a, you know, like the Board is somehow this thing that exists above the GNSO or above ICANN. And it is within the community, it is a voice of the community; it is not a – it's not a separate structure. I guess, you know, technically it is. But, I mean, it shouldn't be seen as some sort of a closed star chamber Supreme Court of ICANN type of thing.

                 And I think that that – it's important that we – it's important that we push back on those and say nope, this is us; this is the GNSO, this is the ccNSO, this is

all of us, and this is how we kind of express ourselves through this microphone called the empowered community.

And I think by connecting it to existing roles as opposed to creating a new role, that I think – and I say that as somebody who, you know, I've got 1 foot out the door, right? I'm term limited out at Abu Dhabi. I just I feel like that is probably the right way to go for the long-term rather than creating a heavier processes that creates a distinctly different role.

That's just my opinion. And just seeing Julf's question, no, I don't think so. I don't think you would add too much to the workload. But I say that noting that the last six months have been very quiet for the empowered community up until very recently. So it's really hard for me to say, you know, if there's something really controversial or the Board has blown up the budget or something really crazy is happening, it's possible that in the future this would become a really huge workload.

But for right now it's very pro forma; it is checking boxes and making sure that all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed. I don't think it's that burdensome yet. Anyway, you asked for my opinion, sorry.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

James Bladel: Sorry if I went too far afield there, but that's just kind of my thoughts on it. But of course…

Susan Kawaguchi: No, I do appreciate it because you're in the role right now so – and, you know, obviously extremely immersed in GNSO Council. So looks like Lori has a question for you.

Lori Schulman: Hi, James. Yes I do. I want to say thank you because really clarifying. I was a rapporteur for the Work Stream 2 Guidelines for Good Faith – I forget the whole long title. But basically it is about the empowered community and the

role on the Board removal side and the indemnity of the empowered community delegates so it's directly relevant to the work that we are doing in Work Stream 2. I just want to preface that for the rest of the group.

And I don't recall if you mentioned, but as you are in the role of the designee for our part of the EC, is there sort of any sort of coordination or reporting that's sent to the community generally? Or is that something that we would have to incorporate into the criteria? Like is this a process that the – at a greater level or a process thing for GNSO? I guess that's my question.

James Bladel: Yes, I understand now. Yes, there is – and that is one of those things that's also just kind of getting underway. There is a – and I'm sorry I have to jump to another call – there is a Website being set up where the discussions and the mailing list and all that stuff will be open, and all of the reports will be published. And I think staff is currently working on that.

Lori Schulman: Right, thank you. So then there's no process to reporting back to the GNSO particularly?

James Bladel: Well only…

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I think yes, that's a good question. I think I really it's more of a one-way, I mean, the representative could come back to Council or the GNSO and say look, on the empowered community we have been asked specifically to do or review X, do we want to do that? And then that would be taken up by the various, GNSO and the SGs and Cs.

I think the other direction would be if one of the stakeholder group said I want the empowered community to consider for example rejecting the budget. So let's take this to Council and if Council approves then we will, you know, then

we will instruct the empowered community representative to, you know, raised this issue and take our concerns to the empowered community.

So that's count of how I see this – I hate to say the word liaison, but it is almost like a – in that the representative is silent unless instructed by the EC to take things back to their communities because some other community has asked – specifically asked them to do so or is taking something to the EC because they've been specifically instructed by their community to raise that issue.

Lori Schulman: Okay, I think that's really helpful because then it sounds like there's process that could be developed on each end of the transaction. And I'm wondering if it's appropriate for this group to think about – well I guess, you know, the process. Does that process get incorporated into the job description somehow or is that (job). I mean, I think you might have answered that question earlier. But I'm just trying to keep it focused on the communication aspect of the role.

James Bladel: Yes, that makes sense. I'm sorry, Susan, I have to join – or I have to drop; I have another call waiting for me to join at 9:30.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: So maybe we can get Maxim's question over to you via email then. Thanks so much, James, for your input. It's been really helpful.

James Bladel: Sure. Thanks. And just give me a shout or drop me an email if you have any other questions. And apologize I had to leave so abruptly, but thanks for inviting me.

Susan Kawaguchi: No, thanks for the flexibility in joining us. Okay, have a good day. Okay, Lori, your hand is still up, is that another comment or…?

Lori Schulman: Yes, I guess I just want to clarify in my own head. It's a small group and I've missed a couple of calls. But so we are sending out the criteria and within the qualifying criteria are we considering a communication process or is that something that's really with the GNSO, as the GNSO to consider in a separate track of work? That's what I'm confused about that's all.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, and I was sort of going down that road too earlier in our conversation today when we were talking about, you know, I think this alternate mechanism procedures or something. But I think James clarified that pretty well that, you know, our job is just to determine criteria for a candidate for this role and then, you know, do the call for candidates and then select the person or role.

     But all the processes and procedures should then – we might identify those as we are discussing, I think that's really helpful. I would think that would be helpful to the part of the GNSO Council that will determine the processes and procedures for the role, not to find a candidate though.

     And so, you know, we can sort of note those just, you know, so that the other groups can be aware they don't have to think it through as much. But it's not our role to figure out how the communication path for and all of the processes surrounding this role, both sides, I think you identified the fact that on the EC itself that there could be processes there that need to be developed, that, you know, GNSO's not going to do that on their own.

     At least that's my take on it. Emily does that make sense to you too from a staff perspective?

Emily Barabas: Hi, Susan. This is Emily Barabas from staff. Yes, that's also my understanding is really for the SSC to focus on the selection process and

implementing the selection process. And as Maxim pointed out in the chat and I think confirmed by James that this group can certainly flag things that might need to be developed down the road but the actual development of those systems and processes and so forth would be for the Council and for the GNSO to do down the line.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And then, Maxim, your question is whether there would be scheduling conflicts. Emily, would you know if, you know, for example if they are scheduling a meeting – Johannesburg meeting or if they were scheduling a session for the Johannesburg meeting whether or not that would be taken into account all of the, you know, SOs and ACs own Council meetings, whether there would be overlap.

Emily Barabas: Sure. This is Emily Barabas again from staff. My sense – I don't have an exact answer and that is something we can bring back to James as well. But my sense is that because for the other SOs and ACs it is somewhat any leadership position for the councilor equivalent to within this role, that they probably need to look at if there is going to be overlap between activities that the Council leads would be required to take, and any commitments in an ICANN meeting for the representative.

Noting also that James said that it's not always the case that there will be face to face meetings at ICANN meetings, and it will be the case in Johannesburg that there will be one face-to-face session but that isn't the norm necessarily, and most processes will happen through email as he mentioned.

And what was the other part of the question? Just about checking for conflicts, right?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Emily Barabas: Yes, but we can certainly pass that on to James as well. But he did also note in his comments that he didn't see that there would be any issue for a chair to serve in both of those roles. So I assume that, you know, that he sees those two things as compatible from a scheduling perspective, but certainly we can confirm.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, thanks. That would probably be a good idea. And, Maxim, you have a question or a comment?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Just funny that when I wanted to ask a question about potential overlap it was an overlap so just noting.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's true. I think James is a pretty busy guy so. So all right so – oh okay, Julf was saying that the scheduling was done by Doodle. So as we also have this chart that Emily and Marika prepared for us today. And I'm assuming some of you have read this and I was wondering if you had any input. I noted Maxim at the beginning of the call had some input. Would you like to go through this column by column or in general did anybody have a viewpoint they'd like to express about how we should move forward with this? Okay not seeing hands so oh, we've got two. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think we might go one by one through the options and I think Frederic and Poncelet is not here we could just send an email to our list saying that during the – this call we discussed this and came to this conclusion but since not all members expressed their opinions, yes, we need to do it by Doodle or something.

And my first notice is about the first line because James expressed the idea that GNSO chair is, yes, fine, and we just add notice that most probably the procedures for fast removal or fast addition of the new representative should be invented without saying by whom. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And Emily.

Emily Barabas: Thanks Susan. This is Emily Barabas from staff. Since some people probably didn't have a chance to look at this too carefully, maybe we can just provide a very high-level overview of what we are looking at and kind of what we've been thinking about in terms of what we would like to do with this and see if that works for people or if they would like to go other ways before running through all the specifics of the text. Does that make sense?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, would you mind just doing a brief overview of the document?

Emily Barabas: Sure. So what we did was we – in the leftmost column, and this is now unsynced so everyone can squirrel around for themselves as they need to do. The first column is just the questions that we were talking a little bit about last week, and I think also the previous week, some of the key questions that this group needs to answer in terms of making a selection.

And then in the second column, just a short summary of input on these questions that Sam and Trang provided in their presentation in the last meeting. The third column looks that a couple of points that this group raised so far especially in terms of criteria for a possible selected candidate. And then what we did in the fourth column was look at some potential options for ways that this group could respond to answering the questions.

So for example in the first row, the question of whether the chair is the default or sort of the fallback option, so essentially where the there is a first choice with another selection process being a second choice or the opposite. And as you can see, there are two options there and just sort of listing those things so the group could select Choice 1, Choice 2, or makeup a different choice. These are not exhaustive options, it's just to start thinking about a framework for answering the question.

So one of the things we were thinking about was potentially sort of opening a poll to see if there is any direction in terms of consensus in the group about

how we might want to start to answer these questions for further discussion. And not something we can discuss if that's something the group would like to do. We can put it together with Survey Monkey after this call. But I'll give it back to Susan to talk further about that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you, Emily, for running through that for us. So I mean, right now the current status is James in the role. I didn't ask him about, you know, straight out but it didn't seem like he felt like this was a burden. He did say that at least for the chair. And I did find it interesting that the other SOs and ACs are all – have all designated their chairs to this role. Not that we need to follow suit but I do think we need to keep that in mind as we are going through the criteria we are developing that maybe we do keep this at a very high level within the GNSO leadership. That's sort of a personal opinion on that one.

And also he stressed that it's, you know, it's simply a communication role and that decisions aren't made. I think, you know, someone on the GNSO Council would understand that better than those who are not on the GNSO Council. So we, you know, I'm hoping we can sort of make this – simplify the criteria and keep it at a high level for the criteria on this role. Does anybody else have any input or thoughts on what they see the criteria is for this role? Maxim, your turn.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. If we want to keep things simple, we still need to be, yes, to allow members who are not on the call to express their ideas. So I think we might create a poll right of the list of questions we see now on the shared screen and maybe to add text field of notice or something in the end where, yes, person can express their additional ideas if any. I hope nobody has additional things, but if we allow only choice of those identified options we might miss something, given two members are not here. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, that's a very good point. So we could take some of the things that we talked about, you know, and that Emily has listed out some of the options,

you know, the rep is selected from current Council – current GNSO Council leadership, the rep is selected from current Council, the rep is a current or former Council member. So we could put this all into a poll. You know, was there any other questions besides the fact – your points that you've made, the term and renewal, Maxim, does anybody else have any suggestions and questions that we should add to the poll that's not in this document?

Looks like a couple of you are typing. So, Lori, I'm not sure what you're talking about as an official alternate.

Lori Schulman: Okay, can I speak? Is that okay?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sure, yes, we'd love to hear your voice.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I didn't raise my hand officially but I'm trying to not be too intrusive because as I've said, I've missed the last two meetings. So, no, that point goes to Emily's suggestion that she speak with that EC to see if there is already an alternative mechanism in place. I was just going to sort of what is the state of play today?

The state of play today is that James is the acting, for lack of a better word, but have that contingency already been discussed about, you know, if he can be available are – is then – is he empowered right now to go to Heather? Or is there a gap there? Or he just has to make sure he never gets hit by a bus or has a stomach bug.

You know what I mean? Like it's an important role and we heard James discuss that attendance needs to be perfect or near perfect. And that's a big burden. And it goes to Maxim's point about a lot of cross-scheduling. And I'm kind of wondering – and this could maybe be out of left field, but maybe it would be useful to maybe have the outgoing GNSO chair, if they're still in the GNSO, maybe we put the burden on someone who doesn't have the day to

day responsibility anymore? But someone who really knows the constituency well.

Because I feel like the primary, you know, consideration should be an understanding about how this SO works. And that it's most likely going to be former officers.

Susan Kawaguchi: I would agree with that. And so we could add that in as one of our options for criteria, outgoing GNSO chair.

Lori Schulman: Yes, or having served as chair at some – or maybe having served share in the last – what is the GNSO chair times out at three years or four years, I don't remember. But of the timeframe be the last one to timeout, maybe 1 to 2 terms. So maybe, maybe not immediately outgoing but outgoing in the last three years or outgoing in four years or whatever that window we think might be appropriate.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. So I think the chair is a two-year term, if I'm remembering correctly with James. So, you know, it could be we would have somebody new every two years. So that's an interesting thought.

((Crosstalk))

Lori Schulman: Yes, so maybe we would recommend for years because that would give you the option of potentially two past chairs, that's what I'm thinking.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, well lets add that to the possible options. And Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think we might add a notice to this – the last question saying that in the case where suggested procedures for fast removal and fast replacement of representative are developed, we don't have to think about the term because it's not important if the procedure of fast removal of representative or fast, yes, replacement is there. The moment the GNSO

Council realize that the chair is no more, they will use the procedure, that's it.
So we just – simplification from procedural point of view.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. So I'm not sure I followed that. If it's the chair – could you just
restate that one more time? I just didn't follow it, sorry.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes. We might add the wording saying that, yes, if we add wording about the
procedures for the GNSO Council to say that this person is no longer
representative us in empowered community administration, and the
procedure of fast selection of new representative from GNSO Council, so…

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay.

Maxim Alzoba: …if they decide to create such procedures, the question of term is not going
to be such importance because they will be able to replace the representative
following this suggested procedure. Yes, as soon as possible, that's it.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Okay that makes sense, okay, we'll note that too. And then, you
know, one thing I've been thinking about is if this is truly not so burdensome,
at least right now, you know, a reevaluation may need to be done down the,
you know, few years if things became turbulent for the empowered
community. But it could be, you know, once procedures are established and
things move along smoothly they could continue to be a lightweight role.

The one thing I've been thinking is what if we simply said the criteria for this
role is anyone in the leadership team of the GNSO Council, so that would
include the chair, or one of the two vice chairs. And then we leave it to the
leadership team to identify which one of those three would fill that role. And
that would also simplify issues when one of them couldn't – couldn't
participate, if they got hit by a bus or in the hospital, one of the other
leadership team could take over, members of the team could take over.

So – and in some ways this may, you know, maybe I'm punting, but you have three very well informed members of Council. They've already stepped up to leadership positions. And to also work very well together; they are obviously in contact continually between meetings also.

And so, you know, if we leave it to them to decide just simply say the criteria is leaders, you know, you have to be someone from the leadership team and identified that as chair, two vice chairs, and then they could work out all of the, you know, who is going to actually follow the EC and participate but then also keep each other apprised of what's going on so that the alternate situation is easily solved when somebody can't make it. So that's just simply my personal thoughts on this in keeping it simple.

And then Julf commented, "Anyone in the leadership team avoids us having to come up with new procedures," that's true. And then Maxim, "With approval of the GNSO Chair and it's not possible for natural reasons by GNSO Council." Julf is agreeing to that.

So let's put that in as one of our possible, you know, options and for the poll. Is there any other thoughts on this? We're about five minutes from the end of the hour. Okay, is there anything you need from us, Emily, for the poll?

Emily Barabas: Hi, this is Emily Barabas from staff. I think we are all set on the poll. I'll circulate around a draft of what that would look like just to make sure that nothing is missing, and then we will open that up and leave it open until shortly before next week's meeting. So I think we're all that are not. I think the only thing we need to discuss is the schedule of upcoming calls so we can get that on the calendar as well. And the proposal was to keep this extending time if that works for people, otherwise we can do a Doodle.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That works. And if anybody – I know – I think Frederic had a continual conflict. But hopefully he can join us via the poll and mailing list. So

is there any other comments or concerns about (unintelligible)? Okay, so Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: I'm just reading notes on the right. I don't think we need to add text as a (unintelligible) select GNSO leadership team. We do not select them. We might suggest that they are used as additional pool. Thanks. Just formal.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. Well, and Emily is going to send around the language for the draft poll so we can always, you know, on the mailing list edit the language in the poll too before it goes out as the official poll. All right, so we're coming up on the hour. Last call for comments. And if you – so we'll get – we'll get the draft out to you soon and then hopefully get the poll going in the next day or so. And maybe we can come to a decision on this.

I did – I forgot to ask James about the RDS Review Team. And I think that we actually did get the four slots that you chose, the candidates you chose are going to be on the RDS Review Team. But I'll reach out to him and have him confirm that. And then we soon, will have the ATRT to work on. So more work in our future. Hopefully it'll settle down after the ATRT. And looks like a couple more comments are being written in the chat. So, Lori, you and I can probably discuss offline on that question, how they're nominated to other teams.

So anyway, I'm – thank you all for your work today. It was a good discussion. And we'll move forward with the poll. So we can end the call. Thanks so much, Emily and Michelle. Bye.

END