ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Wednesday, 06 September 2017 at 18:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ssc-06sep17-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p9d3nuimvti/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/3hghB
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Michelle DeSmyter: Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on the 6th of September, 2017. On the call today we have Susan Kawaguchi, Julf Helsingius, Maxim Alzoba, Renata Aquino Ribeiro. We do have apologies from Rafik Dammak, Poncelet Ileleji, and Frédéric Guillemaut. From staff we have Marika Konings, Emily Barabas, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and I'll turn the call over to Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, Michelle. Really appreciate your support. So, are there any SOI updates that someone would like to make? Julf, go ahead.

Julf Helsingius: Yes, I have a minor one, I actually having joined as an individual member to the Non Commercial Constituency.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay. Well good. And welcome, Lori. And thank you for jumping off the RPM call. Very important call there too. So if there's no other SOI updates, then I think what we're going to talk today about is the ATRT 3 candidate poll and see those results, though I have not reviewed that. And

the – and then in the AOB we'll talk about the GAC liaison selection, which we don't have to do quite yet and the next SSC meeting.

So Emily or Marika, can you present the results? It looks like we've gotten, you know, full response from everybody, which is good, thank you all. And can we see the results? Do I have control of this?

Marika Konings: Sure, yes. Everyone can scroll through the document. We also sent the link around in the email that takes you to a webpage where you can also review it. And you may know that in this version we've actually sorted the results based on the feedback or the responses to the poll questions. Having quickly looked through it, you know, there does seem to be consistency at least with regards to the top four candidates, so that is something that you may want to consider. But we can indeed review through each of the questions if that's helpful.

So for the first question that basically focused on whether the candidate was deemed to have sufficient knowledge and experience with the GNSO community to be able to represent the GNSO as a GNSO endorsed candidate, you see here that I think the results were you know, several of them, you know, pretty close but very clear I think for the – it seems for the top four candidates that they would definitely deemed to be considered as a yes response in that regard.

If you look underneath the colored labels you can see how that was broken down so you see clearly that for the first four, seven of you believe that a yes they did have sufficient knowledge and experience with the GNSO community. And then after that you see the balance is getting a bit more divided where it's more split between yes or no and don't know.

Then the next question focused on skills, expertise and attributes to do the work as outlined in the call for volunteers in relation to this effort. Again, here you see as well that I think the top four candidates here are relatively close

and then even, you know, in the later – the other ones as well there is a bit more of a spread. Again, if you look further down you see especially the top candidate everyone agrees there that that person has the necessary skills and expertise. Then when you go further down, you know, until Number 4, you see that there is a, you know, relatively strong support.

And then after that it becomes again more divided between those that say firmly yes and those that indicate that they say no or they don't know a response to that question. Again, it may be worth noting here I think that this is the only question where the top four is not the same. So again that may be something that you want to factor in as you discuss the results.

Then looking at the next one, ranking them against the skills and experience, and so it's really a ranking exercise going from, you know, 1-9 for people indicating their preference and top candidates. And again, I think you see here very clearly the agreement with regards to the top three or top four candidates, and again then it trails off a bit with the other candidates or at least maybe there's agreement that those indeed do not belong in the top four.

And then the last question, I believe, relates to ranking the candidates in relation to the desired attributes. And here you see as well that the top four, and I think even probably the whole list is actually identical as the previous ranking exercise. So they're, in that regard there does seem to be a clear indication of preferences from the group, although it's worth noting that in this question as well as the previous one, not everyone ranks the same candidates as their number one or number two. So again you can see that in the scoring, but this is based on the aggregate score of the ranking that was conducted.

So that is basically I think the overview as Emily already pointed out in the chat, you're expected to recommend three primary candidates who would get an automatic seat on the ATRT 3 and with the possibility of recommending an

additional four alternatives that the SO and AC chairs can consider if they determine that additional slots need to be – to ensure diversity of the overall group. But again, there's no requirement either to nominate up to seven; it's a choice you have but again, it's an assessment that the SSC needs to make, you know, how many candidates do you think should be put forward for GNSO endorsement.

And Susan, if I can add one other thing as well, something that staff also provided together with the agenda is an overview of the previous appointments by the SSC and affiliation of those candidates that were endorsed as there is a provision in the charter that talks about diversity of stakeholder group appointments over the course of the review team appointments.

So that is also an aspect that you may want to factor into your conversations. And again, it's information that staff has made available for your review and discussion.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, you know, when I was reviewing the candidates to fill up the poll, it – there's – it's very heavy on NCUC and Registry Stakeholder Group candidates. And then there's two unaffiliated and there's one CSG or BC candidate. So – and I guess there's nine candidates in total, right? So only two of these won't be included in our list but we do need to figure out the top three. And it looks like the top three in this is Brian, which makes sense because he's very active in the community. I don't know Wolfgang. Stéphane I'm very familiar with too.

But Stéphane and Brian are both Registry Stakeholder Group candidates, so I think that's one of the decisions we need to make is how important is it to look at gender diversity, geographical diversity and then also diversity among the SGs and Cs. Does anybody have any thoughts on that? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Susan. This is Marika. I just wanted to emphasize one point that I made before and in the chat as well, you know, even though you have nine and you can nominate up to seven, you don't have to. I mean, I do believe there is an expectation that whoever you put forward to be endorsed whether as a, you know, primary three or potential four alternates, you know, are expected to have met the requirements as a result of your evaluation.

So even though indeed you may focus on taking our two you may also need to look at okay, those that, you know, fall in the alternate category, did they meet, you know, sufficiently the test of meeting the requirements and skills to be, you know, be put forward? So again, there's no requirements to put up seven names; you have the option to do that.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay yes, that – I mean, though I do think it was very helpful in the SSR 2 team once Emily Taylor had to step aside that we had candidates that we'd already reviewed and just – it made that process more simple. So Renata.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Thank you, Susan. Renata here. I hope you can hear me okay? I am a bit concerned about gender balance in the selection. The first four candidates we have top three male candidates, then we have one female candidate, then the end of the list we have three female candidates. I would like to express that this that support for seven candidates moving forward. And I would ask the group to consider gender balance in the top three candidates.

And of the seven moving forward, we will leave two female candidates out, so that's one more reason to change that. And, yes, so I guess this would be the suggestion I would make. And I think we have to look into that because of the seven we are sending, we are sending five males and two females. That would be my observations. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Renata. And that is a good point. I mean, I always think we need to balance out the gender diversity. And, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, I have a few thoughts. On the one hand I agree with Renata, but on the other we want to put forward the most qualified candidates. And my guess is, like most people who read this yesterday, or the last few days, is we were gender (balanced), I didn't actually pick gender at all, I just looked at what people wrote and thought about what needed to be done and ranked.

And I wish this were a perfect world and that would work out that there is gender balance, but it didn't. So I think we at least should talk about that a little bit about ranking people unless you know, people said well when I ranked I actually did consider gender balance in my rankings, that would be one thing. But I can tell you that as one of the respondents I did not.

That being said, I also wanted to discuss a little bit about the candidate who (unintelligible) because when I read her application it was clear she's not a – embedded GNSO ICANN insider, she's somebody that appears to me anyway that does a lot of UDRP work, may have a practice that's very relevant to the work of ICANN, but in fact is not, you know, inside in the inside part of the organization.

And so the way some of these questions are asked it could actually work against her because in terms of her knowledge of GNSO, or her reviews that she made on (Fedra), although I do think that the scope (unintelligible) is pretty balanced without necessarily being too (unintelligible).

But would there be a benefit for regional diversity issues (unintelligible) gender diversity and maybe even outlook diversity, to look at some of these lower ranked candidates and look at why they ranked lower. Is it because we feel they really can't do the job or is the – are the results front loaded because we know the other people better? And is that fair?

Susan Kawaguchi: And actually, Lori, if you don't mind me responding directly to you on this, I absolutely agree with that. And that was something I tried to look at. Surely

(Lim) – or (Lin), I was really impressed with her application, and thought that it could provide a – she could provide a perspective that may not exist in ICANN. I think there's absolutely value to having some of a – members on a review team very well inserted in ICANN and understanding the ropes. But it, you know, if one of the – one of the complaints you hear across the ICANN community is there's not enough people to do the work.

But if we don't let newcomers come in and sort of learn those ropes, then we're not going to build a larger community to support the ICANN initiatives. And, you know, in my own personal experience, you know, I was somewhat active in ICANN before I applied for the Whois Review Team, the first one, and – but out of that I learned so much, and I think I contributed quite a bit on the Whois Review Team, and was able to come up to speed on a lot of different issues because of that invaluable experience.

So I think we need to balance very knowledge candidates, knowledgeable about ICANN but also bring in others that are willing and able to learn quickly and come up to speed and have an opportunity to participate. And that was, you know, (Atatolo) is a BC member but he came through the Fellowship program and he's, you know, and obviously I voted for (Atatolo) in this instance – or ranked him high. But (Atatolo), you know, is very eager to join more and do more work and has shown that through, you know, he was a fellow and he came back and has been participating in the mentoring program to mentor new fellows, has reached out to ask other, you know, sort of ICANN-ingrained people to mentor him.

So I think we have an opportunity to grow – help put some of the candidates on these teams to help grow a diverse community to support all the work. Those are sort of my personal opinions. Renata.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hi. Yes, I was just – answer to (unintelligible) gender balance that Lori also said, I did not factor in gender balance when I was doing my ranking or my voting. But I do think we need to think of this now because this last

(unintelligible) if we send the top seven we will be sending, again, five males and two females so double the number of males. And this is quite impressive, I think.

On the composition and on who are we sending, I think it's important that we have candidates that come with knowledge of their constituencies of the stakeholder groups they belong to and have even received comment of endorsement. So the list seems pretty good to me. I would really just make the change of putting on the top three gender balance and I understand (Julian) and (Shirley) did their application – their application could be better, but I think this is also that needs to be addressed on a bigger picture.

The process of call of volunteers and applying to working groups, I am also less than five years in ICANN and I still really have to ask a lot of people before applying to things and filling forms. So, yes, their applications could be better and maybe they would have ranked better. But I do not think this is something we should factor in now in the selection. I do think that we can vote perhaps from SSC to the groups that again, this call should be widely spread and the applications widely discussed.

I would also note (Erica Verlizi), not an insider in ICANN, but the way she described her community, the Wordpress community, which is also a community on (unintelligible), developers and so on all over the world related to a blogging tool that became a Website content managed tool, she has the characteristics for a review team, attachment to transparency and openness, so I think that's why she is better ranked than (Julian) and (Shirley) even though her application as well and her knowledge of ICANN is not as evident as the other candidates.

So once more, I think we should send the seven, I think we should think about gender balance. I wouldn't change much on the list. And I think we just have to note to our constituencies and stakeholder groups to be – to pay more attention to the volunteer calls and to guide people on how to fill them.

Because even if they're not on the constituencies and stakeholder groups they know people that are. And I also know (Atatolo) and I also think that he is – he has been a great fellow but I do think that he is learning so that's probably why, also again, this could have been a better application, but I agree with the ranking. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's a really good point, Renata. And so before we go to Lori, is your recommendation that we right now we have Brian Cute, Cute, I never know how to say his name, Wolfgang – sorry about that – and Stéphane. Do you think we should – whoa.

Lori Schulman: Yes, my apologies. There's another phone.

Susan Kawaguchi: No problem, Lori. No problem, Lori. Do you think that we should move (Erica) or is it Tatiana that I'm – I need to increase my screen size to be able to see, that we should move one of those up? And do we look at balance between the constituencies or stakeholder groups too? So, Lori, did you have…

Lori Schulman: Yes, hi. Just to add to the balance confusion, I just want to point out too that those two lowest ranks are also from Asia, and I don't believe we have any others from Asia. So if we're looking at regional diversity, (Atatolo) is from Africa, we have two from Asia, with the gender diversity goal and the regional diversity goal (unintelligible) constituency diversity. So with all these different factors and a few number of candidates, it does make it challenging.

But I did want to point that out that that's a concern too that if we decide to do as many as seven, the two that we're leaving out are both from Asia. I'd almost rather do six and do three men and three women and leave a third out, since we have sort of the clear three, top three, and then the other three we can fill in for diversity, might be a easier way to – not easier but more justifiable way of doing this, an easy number with even amounts of

(unintelligible) and to the extent that we can mix up the stakeholder groups we do that.

But that we look – and then we'd have to prioritize the diversity, so gender – if we agree that gender diversity is number one, and perhaps constituency diversity is number two, and regional is number three, otherwise it's going to be – I think it's a little difficult.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, no I agree. And (Atatolo) is our only African geo diversity candidate. We have – it doesn't look like we have any from South Africa. So and Renata is saying, you know, of the – of the three women who applied we should send one. And Maxim, I'm confused on which candidate had the registry and registrar support. Was that Stéphane or Brian? Looks like everybody is typing.

Now, yes, I would agree that the Council needs – we need to give top three. Oh so Brian and Stéphane, but also, I mean, there's three spots, there's four stakeholder groups, so, you know, are we – because they have the support of I guess if they have the support of the registrars too.

And Renata, your point of we ask for inclusion of a fourth before but that – to follow the process is – we're only guaranteed the top three and then the reason for giving the other four adding seven, you know, for a total of seven is in the hope that the GNSO chair, James right now, would be able to convince other SOs and ACs if they were not filling their spots to then allow GNSO candidates into those spots. And he was able to do that one time, but I don't think that's a reasonable expectation to send that to him all the time. Yes, I agree with Julf.

So, do we need another poll? Do we I mean, obviously we don't have all the members on the call so we would need to do something on, you know, via email to discuss, you know, to come up with the top three and then the other four. Renata's question, are we not sending the seven? Lori's

recommendation was we only do six – I think it was Lori. But I think we should send seven. But we need to rank the top – the first three or at least say these are the top three candidates, and I don't think we've come – and seven is optional, Lori, it's the way we sort of decided to do it early on; doesn't mean we can't change that.

So does anybody else have – Renata has been very clear that we should move a woman up to the top three. There's some reasons for respecting geographical diversity also. Does anybody have a thought on who those top three should be just based on what we're seeing in the poll? Okay, and we could always ask the fourth, I guess.

Lori and Renata are agreeing. So, Renata, when you say send the top three, are you saying Brian, Wolfgang and Stéphane?

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Sorry, I just got back to the mic, it's faster. Renata here. Yes, if we don't change the order I think we should make a – we should really make the point to GNSO that we had last and a third woman apply, that we have a fourth candidate almost as well ranked as third. So that could be the conversation.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Susan. This is Marika. I just want to reiterate what I think I already said in the chat as well that the fourth candidate I think last time around was kind of a, you know, last minute compromise. I think at the Council level they weren't too happy about it because of course it was indeed a big question mark and a big ask for James to convince the other SO and AC chairs, that, you know, the GNSO needed to have four slots.

You know, from those discussions I know that not everyone was happy with it, there was some resistance but, you know, James did manage to convince them. And I think in the case of the RDS Review Team, there was also a

specific case to be made that, you know, that is a very GNSO-focused topic. I think in this case, and again, you know, speaking personally, I don't have a crystal ball, I think it would be very difficult for the GNSO to get that fourth candidate seat. You know, it's likely that many of the other groups will either fill their slots or that at least a sufficient number of candidates will be provided that there may not be a need for further diversity or balancing.

So I think you really need to give due consideration to indeed, you know, focusing on who is your top three and then of course you can still indeed then rank, you know, the alternates because, you know, as we've seen there may always be people that drop or are no longer available or, you know, maybe there is a need to provide additional diversity. But I think you really – it's a – probably very rare that the same thing will happen with the previous review team.

So I just want you to be aware of that and as such, you know, really have your focus on the top three and indeed decide, you know, what is the most important in that top three. Is that indeed how they meet the criteria and requirements? Is it the diversity of, you know, gender or region? Is it, you know, their knowledge and affinity with the GNSO?

And again, it's probably a balancing act but you know, that's probably something where you'll need to decide. And of course from a staff perspective we're happy to run another poll or see how we can facilitate this, but at the end of the day indeed, you know, a lot of the information is of course already here. I don't know if, you know, it's otherwise helpful to remind everyone again as well indeed, you know, geographic regions, affiliation, again as said, you know, we shared with you as well previous appointments so you can also see the balance in that regard.

And there's of course also the staff assessment that was carried out by, you know, our colleagues who also looked at all the applications and also made an assessment on whether someone met, you know, all the criteria and most

of the criteria or only some of the criteria. Again, that may also help you in making a decision.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, those are all good points. Yes, and I agree that actually trying to push for that fourth seat is – we may be just hitting our ahead against the wall. So in the chat there's been a couple, you know, someone – I'm not following the chat completely, but somebody had mentioned maybe we should just know – figure out who the seven candidates are, remove two so then we just know, okay all of these will be sent but we don't know who the top three are. Or should we flip it around and focus on the top three and then fill in the other four?

And Lori is saying, "I say choose seven and then rank." Does anybody – do we want to follow the poll – if we look at the poll results here, then (Julian) and (Shirley Lim) would be out. And neither of them have a GNSO affiliation which – so I mean, that's because they don't have that affiliation, then, you know, maybe that's a strong reason. And, Renata, I don't know, if because she's Russian but she lives in the EU counts.

So does anybody oppose removing (Julian) and (Shirley Lim) from the list? Several people are typing. It is a tough. And Renata is suggesting we move Tatiana up to third in this list and Stéphane down to fourth. And Tatiana's affiliation is NCUC so that would give us two NCUC candidates and one Registry candidate. I don't have the document in front of me, Marika, on the previous – I feel like we may have left off NCUC before.

Marika Konings: This is Marika – I think it's actually and I'm guessing Emily is pulling it up. I think actually the Registries haven't had a candidate in previous review teams. So while – and you can see it up here, on the document that's up on the screen. So the NCUC actually in the previous one so they in total have had two appointees, CSG has had two appointees, the Registrars have one or some may argue as well, that they, you know, they had two but that one

person resigned and actually the Registries haven't had any appointees in previous rounds.

And again I think here…

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay.

Marika Konings: …of course one thing you do need to consider that is not necessarily that, you know, the Registry candidates didn't get selected in certain cases it may also be the case that there just was no one from a particular stakeholder group, you know, in this case there's no one that's affiliated with the Registrars. So again, I don't recall in the previous two maybe there were Registry candidates that just didn't get selected, but I think you also need to factor in that in some – in certain cases it may also just be the case that there was no one from that specific group.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Marika Konings: And to Maxim's question, there's actually a provision in the charter which is also posted here at the bottom of this page where it basically outlines that there is a – the SSC is encouraged to employ a system of rotation to make sure that any stakeholder group with nominated candidates for a review team, but didn't get selected, shall be preferred as a qualified applicant from the stakeholder group for one of those three guaranteed slots for the next review team appointment process.

So again it's something that's strongly encouraged, you're not required to, but it may be something to factor in. But in this case it does look like at least we'll have one or maybe two Registry candidates potentially in the top three, so it does seem that we're not too far off in that regard with the balance.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so thank you for clearing up my lack of memory on that because I knew we had one underrepresented stakeholder group, I just couldn't

remember which one it was. So it looks like Osvaldo says he doesn't support modifying the order of the poll. And can we flip back to the poll results again that we had up before? So if you're looking at the last page again, that's the one I've been looking at at least, is, you know, so if we go simply on – because everybody filled out this poll.

And if we go simply by this, then – and I'm not suggesting another poll but maybe confirmation by email that we adhere to the results as they're shown here on the second to the last page, I don't know if there's a page number, Page 9. And so it'd be Brian, Wolfgang, Stéphane, Tatiana, (Michael Atatolo), and (Erica) that we'd be dropping (Julian) and (Shirley), and but then just expressing concern about gender diversity and geographical diversity.

But that, you know, and I think Renata put that very well at one point of, you know, the SGs need to do – need to work with their stakeholder groups to really emphasize the need for candidates and a well prepared application because it's, you know, it is what we're going on so.

So I think Julf is expressing support of that. So can we prepare an email to go out and to the, you know, to the whole group and everyone sign off on the list and the ranking? Anybody violently oppose that? Okay, so it looks like Renata agrees. We can express a wish for the fourth seat, but I don't think we can demand, I mean, there's just no way that – I mean, this is part of the way this was all set up, the bylaws is that we can, you know, we have a guaranteed three seats, we don't have a guaranteed fourth seat. And then, yes, and we should highlight that.

And so, you know, maybe, Renata, we can think about the GNSO Council sending out some sort of advisory – I don't know if this would work, Marika but, you know, saying, you know, obviously it's a problem with workload balance, but if more of the SGs encouraged their members to apply. I know the BC does. And that, you know, that we're not getting the diversity gender nor geo diversity that we would like to see in the candidates. So maybe we

can just be proactive. I can bring that up at the next GNSO Council meeting too.

Just making some notes here. Okay. Yes, we can also include that. So before we send out an email, I'll work with staff, with Marika and Emily, to make sure that the discussion was captured and that, you know, that we need more women, more geo diversity and that, you know, those on the call agreed that it should be in this order, but, you know, we were going to emphasize to the GNSO Council that, you know, we want to – we would like to see additional candidates in the future. Perfect on the draft motion so.

Okay, so I think we've sort of come to somewhat of a conclusion on that. We need the input of the other members, and we'll hopefully get that through the – through email. And then Maxim just brought up the GAC liaison. Do we have any idea on who is – do we have any applications filed yet? So are those applications public on the application page, Marika?

Oh, you're saying none have been submitted so far. That's not a good…

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Correct, Susan. And actually I would need to check that because of course previous selections for that role were actually done by the GNSO leadership team. So I'm thinking that at that stage it was actually done but the leadership team they would get the applications, they did an evaluation, but I think the applications were kept confidential. I think for this one we've actually made clear that it would be published unless someone was specifically asked that it wouldn't be shared.

So as we receive applications we will post them on the page – on the wiki where we usually collect all the information related to your selections and nominations. I see Renata's question, "Was there ever a GAC liaison, non-ex Council?" Well we've actually only had two liaisons so far and both were

actually ex Council members as the job description does indicate that, you know, there is a clear preference for someone that has you know, very intimate knowledge and experience with GNSO Council affairs for this role.

So as a result I believe in those two cases it did – it did result in the appointment of a ex Council member. And Susan, there are a number of questions in the chat of people that are considering presenting their applications and whether they should abandon this call, so I'll leave that to you to decide. You're welcome.

Susan Kawaguchi: I don't know. Thanks a lot. I don't think you need to drop off. I mean, we were just going to give an update on it, I don't know that I would encourage you both, Osvaldo and Julf, to apply. But at this point until we have applications, you know, we don't have anything else to discuss about the GAC liaison that would impact your application.

So and Maxim, you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: Thanks. Maxim Alzoba. I just wanted to say that given there are two days left we could expect more than two candidates because, yes, most probably one from the Registries, who knows. But still I support the idea of (unintelligible) in, yes, for these position because yes, after all two is better than one.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay, now I was – no, I agree too. Renata was also saying she'd apply for gender balance, which would be great. You have to be put forward by the SG Cs so individuals can't apply. I'd missed that point or knew it at one time and forgotten. So if we have no applications, and, Renata, I absolutely encourage you to apply or to talk to your constituency or SG.

Is it – have we sent any reminders or updates on the GAC liaison position to the stakeholder groups? Okay, so lots of reminders going on.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. One thing to note there is that I think we usually send them to, you know, the leadership teams of the stakeholder groups and constituencies with the assumption that it's being distributed. So if any of you have not seen that announcement, you know, please let, you know, either get in touch with your leadership team or, you know, let me know and I can forward you the announcement that has been sent because you know, our assumption is of course that it's rightly circulated and as a result applications will come in, but indeed sometimes messages do get lost in people's inboxes. So if you didn't see it, you know, let me know.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so Osvaldo has seen it. I'll check the BC, you know, I've sort of been out of pocket on vacation. And Julf, didn't you just say you were applying for the NCUC so maybe they're your leadership team? That's what I'm wondering. You might ask them to put you forward and Osvaldo obviously your constituency. I'll ping the BC and the IPC.

But I think actually, you know, we could have three good candidates right out of this pool. Okay, oh Maxim, I'm sorry, I missed your hand. Go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Do we know if the constituency has to support each members only or is it possible that constituencies support a particular individual as a constituency?

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so Marika responded, they can put forward anyone they want to support. So there's no requirement.

Maxim Alzoba: Then, I do not think that Julf is not going to be supported because when – during the Registry constituency call I was under impression that yes, most probably Julf could work of Registries. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Maxim Alzoba: But I need to have a conversation with ExComm of RySG, no, no, yes, I understand that Julf had nothing. And, yes, because it's like preliminary thinking hypothetical.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. All right so I would urge everybody to go back to the constituencies too and to urge nominations. Okay, so the next – we should probably – should we have a call next week, Marika, or two weeks from now, if we can do everything by email on the ATRT 3?

Marika Konings: Maybe we could schedule a meeting next week and the week after so we keep a placeholder meeting for the 13th, although actually, and I need to now look back and I don't know if Emily actually has the – the time – oh there it is on the screen. So we have a bit of time for the GAC liaison selection, but it may be helpful to at least schedule a call for next week so we have a placeholder to, you know, iron out any issues that may still exist on the ATRT…

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Marika Konings: …applications. And also then maybe otherwise give you an update on where things stand with the GAC liaison. But to really start discussing that people probably will need a bit more time to review any applications that have come in and you may as well want to have a poll of some kind first before having a meeting. But maybe we just pencil it in for next week and then depending o the response we get on the mailing list for those that weren't able to attend the meeting on the proposed way forward on the ATRT 3 you then may want to decide whether or not to go ahead with that call.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, all right. So we're – we already have a call on the calendar for next – for September 13 you said, right? Let's make sure we keep that one. And then was there any other business? Oh, Maxim, you have your hand up. Or maybe you don't. And Emily is asking if this is a good time slot. I know earlier she said this was what the Doodle poll came up with as the best time slot. Does anybody want to change? Several people are typing.

Julf's okay with him. So Lori's asking, because it does conflict with the RPM call if we could start a half hour later. And Maxim. So, Emily, would you mind – oh okay so you have a meeting, Julf. There's just way too many ICANN calls.

Could we just do a quick Doodle poll again to say – yes. Okay, is there any other action that we need to – or discussion we need to have today? If no one has anything I think we can – oh, Renata.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Renata. Yes, I think it would be good to answer the previous question, if people apply for the GAC liaison, which meetings can they participate, which they cannot? And also, do we have any other process? So just asking for information. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I wasn't quite – you were asking if the GAC liaison can go to all the GAC meetings? Was that the…

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: No, if people are going…

((Crosstalk))

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: If people are going to apply for GAC liaison, do they participate on the next meeting or not? And what are other processes or work that we have moving forward in our group? If we don't have that answer now it's okay, we can follow up on the list. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: So if you've actually applied for a position and we would be considering your application, I think you would need to recues yourself from the deliberations on candidates. That's what I did on the RDS, I didn't participate. So we could always – once we see the applications we could always make sure that happens.

And I don't think – once we get through the GAC liaison and the ATRT 3, Marika, I don't think we have anything else lined up for a while, do we?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And I just posted in the chat as well, then there's probably the right moment for review of the charter because that was one of the asks of the GNSO…

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh.

Marika Konings: …Council because they adopted…

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

Marika Konings: …the charter on a preliminary basis, then you're expected to conduct a review of, you know, how the charter has helped you or not helped you in doing your work. And staff will be working on putting together some materials that may help you carry out that review and put forward any recommendations coming out of that to the GNSO Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Right, and I had forgotten about that. It was on my list but I…

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes, and Emily makes a good point as well, there's also the standard process document, which I believe has been circulated, that would be good as well to probably finalize at some point and have that available on the wiki as a standard way in which the SSC normally conducts appointments.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so since that one – the standard process document was circulated, if people have time please read that again and provide any edits or concerns. And maybe we can add that to the agenda for next week to start a discussion of that and then maybe follow with the charter on top of that. All right, a lot of good work going on and thank you so much for all the participation. We'll get

an email out to the whole committee and see if we can come to agreement on the ATRT 3 candidates. Thanks, all. Have a good day.

Marika Konings: Thank you. Bye.

Julf Helsingius: Bye-bye. Have a good night.

Susan Kawaguchi: Bye.

END