ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
05 April 2017 at 13:00 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-05apr17-en.mp3

AC recording: https://participate.icann.org/p1fr3q3t4m8/

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

Attendees:
Poncelet Illelji,
Frederic Guilemaut,
Maxim Alzoba,
Julf Helsingius,
Osvaldo Novoa,
Hibah Kamal-Grayson (temporary alternate for Susan Kawaguchi)

Apologies:
 Renate Ribeira Aquino
Lori Schulman

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Emily Barabas
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Ed). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening,
                        everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on
                        April 5, 2017. On the call today we have Maxim Alzoba, Frederic Guilemaut,
                        Hibah Kamal-Grayson, who's standing in for Susan Kawaguchi as temporary
                        BC alternate, Osvaldo Novoa. We received two apologies from Lori
                        Schulman and from Renata Aquino Ribeiro.

And from staff we have Marika Konings, Emily Barabas and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for purposes of the transcription. Thank you very much and over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Nathalie, and welcome, everyone. As Nathalie already noted we have two apologies today. I've just sent a reminder to Poncelet to see if he's able to join us as he did respond earlier in email, which does mean we do have a full house as such. And as you know, the SSC is expected to operate in full consensus. So any agreements or conclusions that may be reached as a result of this call today will need to be confirmed or at least other members need to have an opportunity to provide their input before that can become an agreed recommendation or conclusion from the SSC.

But as we do have all of you on the call, I would like to see us that we do go ahead and recognizing the short timeframe that we have available it's important that we do get some discussion in and as noted, everyone was able to provide their input into the survey so at least that should give us good insight into the views and opinions of all SSC members noting that we're still waiting for one confirmation from the NCSG.

Maxim, I see you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I have a question. Why the current voting is limited only to those who choose the checkbox, GNSO, in their applications?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, it's a good question. I know for previous reviews there was confusion around that because I think at that stage as well there was basically everyone could look at all the candidates and endorsements, endorse them. And I know for the previous one, the SSR Review Team, there was actually a situation where a person who had asked confirmation or

endorsement by one group was actually endorsed by another, that they didn't specifically ask for endorsement for.

But I believe for this one staff has requested that the different SOs and ACs look at those candidates that have indicated that they want to receive endorsement from those respective SOs and ACs noting that, you know, they either have a specific affiliation or believe that they're suitable to represent that specific group as part of the RDS Review Team. And that is why at least the request has been as such that the focus is on those candidates that have requested the GNSO endorsement.
You know, from my side I cannot say that that prevents you from looking at any of the other candidates, but of course the question is, you know, what value is there for this group to look at people that have indicated that they actually want to represent another entity while you already have a pretty long list of people that are specifically looking for GNSO endorsement? But of course, you know, that is up to you.

I did circulate the link to the full list of applicants for which it has been indicated which groups they have requested endorsement of, so of course if you want to go back to that definitely an option. But as noted, the expectation from the GNSO Council is that you provide your recommendations ahead of the next meeting so that may require some additional time and effort then to look at those candidates that have indicated that they're looking for endorsement from other groups than the GNSO.

Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, I understand from the conversation with James Bladel, if we feel that we need more time like one week, it could be easily arranged. And even if the situation that we need more than one week we might request more time, because he told me it's already like bit late in the process. So there is not much difference for them.

And am I understand it's right that formally the support from different SO is expected later than we choose candidates? It's like something we are putting cart in front of the horse because what reasons to choose out of them who are not supported because they most probably will just like choosing one who will not sure they pass. So what's the reason for this time race between like final date of support, information and our like (unintelligible)? Thanks. My suggestion is that we either ask by secretariat that the answer is like expected to be after than 25th or we ask for extension so we choose after the confirmation comes. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Maxim. I think the different deadlines and timings you're referring to. So maybe clarify the different steps and timing, you know, let me try again. So the basically the GNSO Council has asked the SSC to provide your recommendations for those candidates that should receive GNSO endorsement in time for the GNSO Council to be able to consider this during their meeting on the 20th of April.

In order for that to happen, those – the motion and names would need to be submitted by the 10th of April which is the document deadline for the GNSO Council meeting which is coming Monday.

Once the GNSO Council has received those proposed endorsed candidates, they will consider those and they will have to vote on it. So they will have to decide whether or not to follow the SSC recommendations, you know, in the format you provide them, or make changes or send things back but, you know, provided that they agree with your recommendations, they would adopt the nominations. And those would then get communicated to the SO and AC chairs.

So basically the SO/AC chairs receive a list from the GNSO saying, these are the GNSO endorsed candidates. And again, within there, there's likely or again that's of course up to you, there may be a top three, which automatically get a seat. And then there's a top four to seven, which are

potential additions to the review team should the SO and AC chairs decide that additional expertise or diversity is needed to fill up the full slate of candidates. And again, that only happens if not all SOs and ACs endorse three candidates.

So basically the – what happens the date of the 25th of April, that is a deadline that has been suggested by staff supporting the selection and subsequently as well the RDS Review Team, to have the nominations from the different SOs and ACs. Because only based on those nominations, the SO and AC chairs can finalize their selection.

In that part there is no role for the SSC or the GNSO. That is a role of the GNSO Chair which will be directed through the information that, you know, through the process that the SSC is currently conducting which then hopefully will be endorsed by the GNSO Council. And that will basically provide the marching orders to the GNSO Chair as the SO/AC chairs gather to confirm the members of the RDS Review Team.

So I'm hoping that that at least explains a little bit the sequence of events and work, you know, what the role of the SSC is versus the role of the GNSO Council versus a role of the GNSO Chair in this process.

Now having said that and Julf, I see you in the queue, if I can just say one more thing. Yes, the 25th of April deadline to have nominations in, that is a suggested deadline. The GNSO could definitely go back and say we need more time. But I think in that case you do need to be conscious as well that it likely will mean that GNSO Council consideration wouldn't happen or couldn't happen until the May meeting which may mean that the review team doesn't happen or cannot be formed even before Johannesburg or just before Johannesburg.

Which, you know, again, may not be an issue but it may be important if that is indeed the path you want to take that you provide a rationale as to why you believe additional time is needed.

Julf, go ahead.

Julf Helsingius: Okay yes. This is Julf for the record. So yes, I actually – I have annoying (standard) to prefer simple solution. So I would just like to throw in the air, why can't we just take the list we have on the screen right now with the – as they are ranked now, take the top three as our primary candidates, I see we have a pretty good geographical diversity there. We have a problem in that we have no men in there so we might want to look at the diversity from that point. But I think other groups will have more men in there.

And then take the rest as candidates 4-7 in that order they are here. I mean, it sounds simplistic but is there any reason not to do it that way?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Julf. I think that's a very good question. I see Poncelet has his hand up. Go ahead, Poncelet.

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes, good afternoon, folks. Thanks, Marika. I just want to say I am – support also taking the top three as they are (unintelligible) but in my opinion they happen to be the best and that's why they are the top three and then the others falling to the (unintelligible). Depending on how we want to look at it. But I think the top three based on the analysis of what's (unintelligible) they were the best so if we do it doesn't show there's any men there but we always have seen (unintelligible) all men. So kudos to all the ladies that are making the top three. So I want to endorse that. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Poncelet. And I also see that Osvaldo has supported that suggestion made by Julf just to look at the names and see if people can come to agreement. I saw some questions on the top three. And, Julf, you are correct, from my understanding as well, the top three candidates

automatically get a seat on the review team. There is no order in that sense so there may not be a need to further refine that.

But indeed, there is a question for the Number 3 to 7 seats whether you do want to provide a ranking to the GNSO Council for consideration or, and that is I think what happened in the case of the SSR Review Team where the feedback from the small group that reviewed the candidates actually was Number 3 to 7 we believe are equally qualified for the role and we accept that there may be a need to balance the review team based on gender diversity or geographic diversity or skill diversity.

So we actually leave it up to the SO and AC chairs to pick from that list of alternates if needed or if desired without putting a number on that. So again, that is something you will need to consider. Something I pointed out as well, the ranking from 1-6 is pretty consistent if you look at Question 3 and 4, taken together with Question 5, but with regards to the Number 7, there's actually a difference between if you just looked at the ranking, the overall ranking, and the score based on Question 3 and 4.

And again, you know, completely up to you whether you want to balance those two or whether you firmly want to go with the ranking based on Question 5 and how to come to agreement on how that should look. So I believe if we follow indeed Julf's approach it seems that, you know, the top three names it's clear so it would be Susan, Erika and Stephanie.

And then the question is, you know, 4 to 7, so there are two questions there, does there need to be a ranking provided for the Number 4 to 7 candidates? And should the ranking follow the order based on Q5? Or should changes be made based on your review of the results and/or the responses to Question 3 and 4?

I see Poncelet noting that go with the top three and just take the Number 4 to 7 based on the ranking so based on Question 5. So that would mean that the

4 to 7 candidates would be Volker Greimann, Marc Anderson, Stefania Milan, and Timothy Chen. Osvaldo is suggesting that we should study the ranking of the next four.

Frederic, go ahead.

Frederic Guilemaut: Hello, all. Right, I have a look at the ranking. I don't have the same ranking, but overall it looks pretty the same, maybe the order is not different. But (unintelligible) only one common person, and I know we should choose by consensus at some point. I think if I understand well the Question 5 – Q5 was the ranking that we would give to the people. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yes, Frederic, that's correct. Question 5 was basically everyone was asked to rank the candidates in order from 1-14.

Frederic Guilemaut: Okay.

Marika Konings: The other two questions, Question 3, went more to the do you believe this person can represent the GNSO? And I think the other question was more in the line of do you think that the person has necessarily expertise and qualification to undertake the work?

So to a certain extent of course, presumably, those have fed into the ranking that people did in Question 5. You know, I just pointed out that there's a – if you look beyond the Number 6 there is some discrepancy between how people were ranked and how they were rated on their, you know, being able to represent the GNSO and being able to undertake the work.

But, you know, if there's a clear direction from the SSC that what counts is Question 5, it's of course free – it's of course preferably fine as well to ignore that other part or at least give less relevance to the ranking based on that and purely look at the ranking based on Question 5. That make sense?

Frederic Guilemaut: Okay, yes, okay, so, yes my point of view would be we have the look at the applications, we gave some marks or some answers, yes, no on Question 3 and 4. But basically I guess we all did the same. We used Question 5 to make our classification. So I think Question 5 should be – Q5 should be the main points, the biggest item we should use for the classification. And which would help me for me because for me the (unintelligible) was within the seven and for – Q5. But Q5 was really the classification we all had in mind so I think we should use that. That's my opinion. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Frederic. And I see several people in the chat supporting that view. So if that's the agreement at least from those on the call, we can just focus on the rank based on Q5 and that's what you see in the column on the screen as well.

Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I have two concerns. First of all, we actually were asked about our opinion of the level of support which I think is a bit irrelevant given that it doesn't matter because the level is from the chairs of constituencies. And the second thing is we have three (unintelligible) who has nothing to do with the voting effectively on the list. And mathematically that affected the score. So even if they have lower ranks, formally we have – we voting (unintelligible) incorrectly. That's why I suggest that it's seen as a draft. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Maxim. I don't really understand your first point. This is Marika. I don't understand your first point because I think the question that was in the survey was more about do you believe this person is able to serve as a GNSO representative? It doesn't ask whether this person is a member or affiliated with the GNSO. At least my understanding has been that it's – there's no requirement for a candidate to be a GNSO member or a member of a stakeholder group or constituency, but it's more about whether you

believe that that person can serve and represent the GNSO on the review team.

And of course, it may be linked because if a person is not actively involved it may automatically mean that you believe that that person is not qualified, but it doesn't necessarily mean just because someone is not affiliated with the GNSO that you cannot consider that person as a candidate. So again, it may be worth discussing that if people believe that there should be a new voting or a new ranking exercise in which those candidates are excluded, but I just would point out that for those that did not or for whom the GNSO affiliation is not clear they actually clearly rank in the bottom of the exercise, so they ranked on Number 12, 13 and 14 if you look at the Question 5 results.

Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: I suggest that we have voting with a clear text which cannot cause confusion is the first thing. And then I suggest that it composed only of the persons who are eligible, because I have degree in physics and I did my share of (unintelligible) everything before you set up your like tasks you have to properly choose the items you need here. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Maxim. But just again pointing out from a staff perspective, all these candidates that you see on the screen are deemed eligible. I think the only reasons why certain candidates may have not been included is if they did not complete the application process or they withdrew their application. But from a staff perspective based on the criteria that were outlined in the call for volunteers, all these candidates that requested GNSO endorsement met the criteria to apply.

As said, you know, if you as an SSC want to add additional criteria by which you would exclude a candidate, you can of course do so. But of course one caveat I would like to put forward there is that of course that is something that was not communicated to candidates in advance. You know, the call for

volunteers, for example, did not state that someone had to be a member of a GNSO stakeholder group or constituency.

So it would maybe create an unfair situation whereby some people applied for GNSO endorsement expecting, you know, fair consideration as there were no specific criteria provided in advance.

Again, this may be something – and, you know, I want to point out here and I think you may have seen that as well in the SSC charter that when there is more time there is ability as well for the SSC, for example, to possibly involve in the drafting of call for volunteers or to be able to provide specific guidance that can be included so that those that apply for GNSO endorsement are able to consider that as they file their applications.

Maxim, I note as well that you called GNSO candidate; again it's looking for GNSO endorsement, it doesn't equate to being a member of a GNSO stakeholder group or constituency. The question here is which candidates does the GNSO want to endorse. And again, you know, based on I think the ranking that people did, it's clear that you value the importance of someone being clearly affiliated with a GNSO stakeholder group and constituency so that may say enough.

But again, I'm not clear on what value would be gained at this stage in the process of kind of taking out those candidates that weren't aware of that requirement while they were in any case ranked as 12, 13 and 14 as the last candidates in the ranking.

So I don't know, does anyone else want to weigh in? Do you also believe that this should be done again and taking out the candidates that do not have a clear affiliation with the GNSO? Or are you of a different viewpoint? I see Julf posting that he doesn't see either how it would change the results. Do others want to weigh in? I see Osvaldo noting it's up to the GNSO to decide who to support and we are not sure who they are right now.

Poncelet also says it's not going to say anything; we stand by the results. Maxim, I see you have a question on geo diversity. Go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually I think that from the legal perspective, because obviously those RDS issues are – have three sides I say, the technical like how DNS or future DNS is going to work, it's operational, how contracted parties are going to exchange favors and (unintelligible), etcetera, and legal, how do we deal with the legal implications.

And from the (unintelligible) point of view, I think the geo diversity like the Asia Pacific region is important because for example, America and Europe, they have quite different opinions on personal data but Europe regions more or less, unified. So if we have a candidate from North America and Europe, and actually I see that we have both of them in top three, then it's fine. But I suggest that we ensure that at least one candidate with a legal experience from the Asian Pacific goes there because there are quite different ideas in that region. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Maxim. Just to note for based on the ranking of Question 5 as it currently stands, the representations or those candidates would come from North America and Europe, I see correctly, there wouldn't be anyone in there from the African or Asian region. But as noted as well, of course there may be candidates from the other groups that may meet that criteria. And again, that's one of the reasons as well why the SO/AC chairs have been designated the ability to balance out the candidate pool once they have a clearer picture of all the candidates that have been nominated by the different groups.

Just one thing to note as well, and I do believe that there is agreement or there is a narrow focus for the RDS Review Team, and I think that one of their main focuses is expected to be focusing on the previous review and if

and how those recommendations were implemented, which of course still means that a broad expertise will be viable for that effort.

So where does that leave us now? I've seen some comments in the chat, you know, do we need another vote? I see Julf saying as well, you know, it could also be in the form of, you know, this is the list we've come up with, is everyone happy with that? So where do you want to go from here?

I think we still don't have a clear answer on 4 to 7 whether if there is indeed agreement on the list as based on the ranking in Q5, whether that should be provided as a firm order or whether you believe that that list should be provided noting that, you know, it's really up to the GNSO's Chair in that case due to balance out the expertise that is believed to be missing whether it's based on skills, expertise, geographic diversity, gender diversity. So that is one question.

And then indeed the next question is how do we go next? Is it indeed an acceptable approach to put those seven names to the list and ask for everyone to confirm whether people are comfortable putting forward those seven names as the proposed candidates to be endorsed by the GNSO? Is further consideration needed? You know, Maxim pointed out the need for geographic diversity or expertise. Does that need further consideration?

How do you propose we go from here? Frederic, go ahead.

Frederic Guilemaut: Hello. Frederic for the record. I mean, we have a basic list and I think we should now have some discussions, maybe some people would have to push some candidates to think that are not at the right place. For example, for me I have – I would like to see someone better on the application and we should be ready to give some arguments, some rationale for that. I think that could be a nice way to complete the discussion and then being (unintelligible) the global list once we reach consensus. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Okay thank you, Frederic. So if I understand you correctly, what you would propose to be the next step is that staff sends out the list of the three top candidates noting that, you know, those had the clear support based on the results of the survey and that the proposal is that those would be submitted as the, you know, guaranteed seat candidates for the RDS Review Team.

Then we also list the Number 4 to 7 candidates based on the ranking of Q5 and basically ask everyone to weigh in whether they have any concerns about providing that Number 4 to 7 as the potential alternative or additional candidates to be considered should there be an opportunity to do so. And allow for people to weigh in if they believe that there should be a change in that, whether there should be a specific ranking in that or whether it's just indeed a list of four additional names that are provided that can be put into the conversation when the SO and AC chairs gather to confirm the review team. Did I understand that correct? You have your hand up so I probably didn't get that right. Go ahead.

Frederic Guilemaut: Yes, well sorry, maybe I didn't express myself well. But I would like to send to staff a list of seven people. But I would – we could take aside the top three and then make the discussion on Number 4 to 7 between us. I wouldn't want to send out a list before we reach a consensus on the whole thing. The discussion we should have would be on like who should be Number 4, who should be Number 5 and then once we all agree we can send the whole global list.

Marika Konings: Okay. Thanks, Frederic. This is Marika. So just to confirm, you want to have that conversation now basically within this call and then hopefully out of this call there's agreement on 4, 5, 6, 7 which then will go to the mailing list for confirmation or input by those that weren't able to join this call and then hopefully that will result in a kind of final agreement which would then get communicated to the GNSO Council. Is that what you're proposing? Did I get that right?

Frederic Guilemaut: Yes. But in fact you're right, if we are missing some people it would be unfair to have a discussion with them.

Marika Konings: Right, so maybe what we can do then, and Poncelet, I'll get to you in a second. So maybe indeed we can have an exchange of views on, you know, the current ranking of 4-7 and at least get the opinions of this group. And again, it's something we can capture. And then send that out to the list asking for everyone to provide input on that.

And as you know, we have another call scheduled tomorrow. So if we're not able to come to agreement on the list on that order then we may need that other call to kind of finalize that aspect of the work. And again, I would like people to weigh in as well on the question indeed do you also agree with Frederic that it's important to rank Number 4 to 7 or do you – are you of the view that it should just be, you know, four additional names in no particular order that are provided?

Poncelet, go ahead. Poncelet, if you're speaking we cannot hear you. You may need to unmute your microphone.

Poncelet Ileleji: Yes, Poncelet speaking for the record. I just want to clarify – I just want to clarify what I said earlier on. I think the top three have the consensus in my opinion, and we should stick to those and we should now weigh in on the criteria for 4 to 7. Are we going to use Question 5? Are we going to get a consensus on using Question 5 to weight them or not? I think we should – I don't think there should be any dispute about the top three, it should be about 4 to 7, what criteria are we going to use?

Are we going to use Question 5, which personally I prefer and I think Julf also mentioned it. So I would like us to go that way because we really don't have much time and if we mention that to the (unintelligible) list then we can – I think it would be very clear for them that we are focusing on 4 to 7 on the way forward. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Poncelet. I believe from what I heard and saw in the chat I believe most people expressed their preference to use indeed Question 5 for that ranking. If that is incorrect, you know, please feel free to speak up or type in the chat. I'm just putting in the chat as well that based on the ranking of Q5 the Number 4 to 7 would look as follows, so Number 4 Volker Greimann; five, Marc Anderson; six, Stefania Milan; and seven, Timothy Chen.

So I think the question then for you is are you comfortable with that ranking? Do you believe that should be different? Should it be in a different order? Are there people that should move up? Again, it's really up to you to decide how you want to go about that.

I'm seeing a number of people saying that they're okay with the ranking. Osvaldo is indicating that. Hibah is also indicating that she's okay with that. Frederic is okay with those four people. Poncelet also confirmed that he's okay with the ranking. Julf? Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim for the record. Could you please make this window wider? Because I'm constantly moving to left to right, but makes notes window smaller so we can see it.

Marika Konings: Maxim, it's actually – unfortunately the space we have. But if you click on the arrows at the top of that pod that say Full Screen you'll be able to fill out your whole screen with the able. I also sent it to you separately so you can pull it up. And there's also the ability to zoom in and zoom out. But unfortunately the Adobe Connect real estate is in such a way that not everything fits on the whole screen so my apologies for that. So hoping in that way you can see it.

As said, I mean, we're not taking any final decisions on the call here today. So maybe the way forward would be to, you know, put the agreement or the proposed approach as we've discussed on the list and ask everyone to weigh in. So that would be, first of all, you know, confirmation that the top three

candidates are to be confirmed as they were ranked. And then listing those that were ranked 4 to 7 asking indeed whether people are okay with that ranking, and if not that they can provide their input as why that should be changed.

Now we have a call tomorrow in which we can further discuss and review the input that will have been hopefully received between today and tomorrow and make any updates or changes if needed. We do need to have I think a formal consensus call or at least then after that call again put out on the list what was agreed by those that either weighed in on the mailing list and/or on the call and confirm that everyone is supportive of that.

Based then on the outcome of that, a motion will need to be drafted, and I'm happy to prepare a first draft if that's helpful, and noting that, you know, Julf is one of the Council members maybe I could work with him to get that then submitted by the deadline which would basically spell out the recommendations of the SSC with regard to the Number 1 to 3 slot as well as the 4 to 7 slots which will then be put forward to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think, yes, as we are appointed by our constituencies, we have to relay the information to them to have their response back by us. So I suggest we make decision when we have the information from our constituencies. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Maxim. And is it feasible if we get that email out today to get that input by tomorrow's call?

Maxim Alzoba: I'm not sure that it's realistic expectation because we not all – not all members of all constituencies are available in 24 hours due to the time

difference, things like that. And I'm not sure that it could be properly done before the beginning of the next when we reach out to the members. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Maxim. Of course another alternative could be that indeed we send out the list today, we ask everyone to, you know, weigh in as soon as possible. We do not have the call tomorrow but we keep the call on Monday. That would then hopefully allow, you know, people to weigh in on the list. It will allow people to go back to their stakeholder groups and constituencies for confirmation. And then would still allow for potential modification on Monday.

Although, you know, at that stage it gets of course very close to the deadline and, you know, we would need people to, you know, hopefully respond and be able to participate in that call so we can come to a conclusion. Although I do want to point out, you know, if Julf is the person submitting the motion, you know, should there be a need to there's always an ability as well to kind of withdraw that should there be reasons for doing so. But maybe that is a way of moving forward.

And, yes, Julf, I agree, it does create a situation if someone comes back and says, you know, I cannot agree that there is then very little time to try to resolve that. But, you know, and we can still keep both. I mean, we can still go ahead tomorrow as well and see at least what the feedback is that people have been able to obtain and then keep the call on Monday as a backup to allow for any kind of final input or updates that may need to be made.

Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. When could we expect the Mp3 record, yes, maybe transcript if possible and the (unintelligible) and notes from this meeting? Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Maxim. They should normally get circulated pretty shortly after this meeting. And I think the notes will be almost instantly because we can copy

and paste those. And I think the recording is usually made available pretty quickly as well.

The transcript may take a little bit longer, I think I see Nathalie typing so she may be able to confirm. So that information should be out pretty quickly. And then I hope to send as well in the next couple of hours the summary email of our discussion and to request everyone for feedback. I actually have to leave immediately after the call so I won't be doing – be able to do it immediately after that but it should happen in the next couple of hours.

And Nathalie just noted as well recordings and notes will be circulated under – a couple of hours after the end of the meeting. Transcript will be available in the next 8-10 hours. Julf, "Is the transcript for general circulation?" Yes, if you would want to we're currently operating under, you know, the normal guidelines in relation to transparency so the mailing list is publicly archived and recordings and transcripts are posted on the wiki as well as the master calendar.

So not seeing any further hands, I think we do have a clear path forward. So just to summarize, we'll send out the notes, recordings after this meeting. Shortly after the meeting I'll also send a summary email confirming at least the – I think agreement of the participants on the call today of having the, you know, the three top ranked candidates as the confirmed candidates and then the ranked 4 to 7 candidates as the ones that would be proposed by the SSC to the GNSO Council for GNSO endorsements.

Those that were not able to participate on the call are then asked to weigh in. And of course you all have an opportunity as well potentially on further reflection or consultation with your respective groups to provide further feedback. We then tentatively have a call – or we have a call scheduled for tomorrow. We'll go ahead with that call unless there's a clear indication on the list that there is broad agreement and no need to have a further discussion.

But again, I would rely on you to give a clear indication if you believe that there's no need to go ahead with such a call. And I think we especially need to ask those that weren't able to participate today because of course they didn't have an opportunity yet to express their views. And then we still have a call on Monday as well that we'll keep in place in case we need to have a further conversation or finalization of the list.

In parallel I'll start working on a draft motion which again I'm also happy to share with you which basically would kind of follow the approach which the GNSO has also done for previous review teams and kind of outlining where this has come from and what are the recommendations and include of course the proposed endorsed candidates based on the SSC recommendations.

Maxim is asking, "What's the date UTC time by when we need to say yes, we need tomorrow's call, no we do not need it?" I can put in the message basically maybe very early – well that would be my time, let's see, what time – our call is scheduled tomorrow, if I'm not mistaken, at 1600 UTC. So maybe we need people to weigh in by 1300 UTC at the latest whether they believe whether or not the call needs to go ahead? Do you believe that's sufficient notice?

So we'll aim for that. I'll put that in my message that people are expected to weigh in on that question. And then staff will make an assessment at 1300 UTC whether or not to go ahead with the meeting or whether it's better to cancel.

Oh Maxim is suggesting, "Doodle poll finishing by the time with yes no comments." Maxim, are you suggesting that we have a Doodle poll on whether or not to have the call or am I missing?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, it's Maxim Alzoba. I think it could be simpler to send a Doodle poll saying hello, members of SSC, we have a short Doodle poll saying if we need

the tomorrow meeting at all or not, and if we either do not have enough people or if we do not have again but we will talk about, yes, if we do not have subjects of conversation. Then must probably we will not need that. So that's my suggestion. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Okay, I think that's a great suggestion. I think we can do the poll in two ways, the one I think is do you believe we need a call and that can be yes/no and, you know, if there is a call are you able to participate because I guess it's two separate questions because someone may want a call but if they cannot attend, you know, there's no need to go ahead because that person will not be there anyway. So we'll add that to the message that goes out in relation to the kind of conclusions of this meeting and proposed step. And of course as soon as everyone has filled out the poll we will then be able to confirm whether or not the call goes ahead.

All right, I think we accomplished a lot during the meeting today. I can give you nine minutes back of your time. And please look out for the messages that will go out to the mailing list shortly. And thank you, again, for, you know, working with us on this short timeline and hopefully we'll be able to conclude our work soon and start looking ahead at some of the other projects that you have on your list. All right, thank you very much. Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, everybody. This concludes today's call. Operator, you may now stop the recordings. Thank you.

END