EN

ICANN Transcription

GNSO Standing Selection Committee

Thursday, 14 January 2021 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. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/SANACQ

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

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Thursday, 14th of January 2021. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call taken; we'll be taking attendance via the Zoom room. This call is being recorded so please remember to state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to keep your microphones and phones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

A little reminder too that the raised hand option is now under the reactions feature under the shared part of the Zoom room. So, if you're looking for it, you'll find it under reactions.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with expected standards of behavior. [inaudible] all this, I'll turn it over to Sophie Hey. Please go ahead, Sophie.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks, Nathalie. Okay. So, first of all, apologies, this is my first time chairing an ICANN call. So, please bear with me—I'll be doing my best though. First of all, I'd just like to ask if there are any updates to statements of interest? Hearing and seeing nothing we'll move on.

So, today we're going to be looking at whether or not to appoint Heather Forrest as GNSO representative to the Community Representatives Group (or CRG). Then we'll look at—after we have discussed that—we'll move on to looking at the content of the report that we've been asked to submit to SG and C leadership on the selection process. And then we'll also have a discussion on what the SSC should be commenting on whether there should be a second process for EOIs for CRG candidates. We might end up overlapping a little bit on items 3 and 4, particularly if we want any of our comments from the report to apply to the new process for EOI for the CRG candidates.

So, with that, what I'll do first of all is I'll ask staff if they could please give us an overview of the poll results that most people I think on the call managed to fill out, and then we'll turn to having a discussion. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:	Thanks, Sophie. Hopefully, everyone can see the screen here. And first, I just want to say thanks to Sophie for stepping in last minute to fill in to chair the call—much appreciated.

So, we had six responses to the poll which is great. Thanks to everyone who filled it out. And what we see here is that there's overwhelmingly responses affirming the belief that Heather is in fact qualified for this position. You can see here in response to the first question about her overall qualifications. Everyone who responded to the poll agreed that she's qualified. And I did also want to mention that—I'm just looking in my email—there's one additional response that came in today by email from someone who missed the poll. It was Peter, who also said that he felt that Heather was qualified. So, actually seven responses in total.

On the more granular questions about Heather's qualifications with respect to—this one is about overall qualifications. Two people responded with a score of 8 and four of 10. The candidates understanding of the IRP and ICANN's accountability mechanisms. Again, high scores all around: 8s, 9s, and 10s, mostly 10s. On Heather's relevant experience, five people responded with a 10 and one responded with an 8. And on her awareness of the GNSO's diversity of interests, one 8, one 9, and four 10s. So again, overall, a high score.

And just highlighting—and I'll [land] here with the screen share on additional comments—again, the comments are quite positive. I'll let everyone just go ahead and read those themselves. And I'll actually read out Peter's comment from email in case anyone didn't see that. He says, "Heather is an experienced folk and well knowledgeable in the ICANN environment, though the SSC does

not have enough of an expression of interest for consideration, and that limits the thorough assessment that could probably be done. However, I think Heather will do well in the role."

So, with that I will hand it over to Sophie to facilitate a conversation—I know not everyone felt that that was necessary but for the sake of being thorough and complete—just having a bit of an exchange is I think the suggested path forward. Thanks.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks, Emily. Okay, so I'm seeing here that Jothan's put in chat about missing the poll email and that he's in favor 100%. Also, Jothan, I'm sorry to put you on the spot. Did you want to say anything in addition to that to replicate what you might have said in the poll at all?

JOTHAN FRAKES: No, I'd want to go through the questions and answer them, but I think my scores would be right aligned with what the group said. I appreciate the opportunity Sophie, but no thank you. The vote stands.

SOPHIE HEY: No problems at all. The other one I just wanted to note is Naveed. He said that he worked with Heather on SSR2. I just wanted to also offer you the opportunity to make any comments you might have otherwise made in the poll. Sorry to put you on the spot. You're welcome to type in chat that you don't want to.

EN

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, I don't have a specific comment, but having known her personally because we worked almost two years on the review team, I think she's fully capable of doing this role.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay perfect. Thank you—Craig yes, go ahead.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Hi, Sophie. Just a quick comment. And I did this over email in the last day or two. I appreciate that a lot of people know Heather personally and that can attest to her capabilities. But I think going forward that the EOI needs to be a lot more explicit with respect to the questions that it asks so respondents can speak specifically to those items. And I think back to the EOI that was posted for the fellowship mentor opportunity and there were many, many very specific questions which helped us assess those candidates. On the EOI for this role, we just didn't have that specificity and that to the extent that we do another EOI—and I know that we'll talk about that later in the call— I do think that the form itself needs to have some consideration for updating it. Thanks.

SOPHIE HEY: Perfect. Thanks, Craig. So, that's definitely something that we can make sure we discuss in the next stage. And I definitely agree that there's the concern with—and I personally agree that the EOI is not enough. Okay, so the question I would then ask is do you think it's too—and this is to everyone—do you think it's too late in the

process to be asking Heather for extra information? Is that what you're suggesting? Or are you thinking this is just something to note moving forward?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: I think if it was someone who was not very well known across many of the stakeholder groups and constituencies that it might be worthy of a second look, but Heather is more of a known quantity. I think this is more focused on going forward on what we should be doing to give the SSC members enough information to make a good quality assessment.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful, Craig. I'm seeing that Marie's agreeing with you in chat. I'd just like to also ask for any final comments on whether or whether to not appoint Heather as the GNSO representative? Just a final call for comments. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands so my recommendation at this point would be that the group based on the full is—sorry just seeing something in the chat.

So, I'm bearing in mind that there's also the issue that Heather was the only candidate. Heather was the only candidate that came forward, so there is this situation that right now we are faced with either appointing someone or not having GNSO representative. However, the sense I'm getting from the responses in the poll but also saying in chat and with the comments that have been made today, that we're supporting putting Heather's name forward as a GNSO representative.

So, what I'd suggest for now is that staff draft—not staff, sorry—that we put a motion to the list saying that this the consensus position we've arrived at. Heather will be our representative and then have perhaps an extended—I'm not sure, forgive me, I'm not sure of the normal time we have for waiting for our position to a full consensus for the SSC.

Maybe if we add an extra 24 hours onto that to allow for not everyone being—yep, maybe we could increase it to 48 given that not everyone's on the call today and not everyone completed the poll. Just to make sure that everyone does have the opportunity to chime in and oppose if they want to for Heather.

So, end of day Monday. Okay, does anyone have any objections to leaving this open for discussion till end of day Monday on list? Seeing and hearing none. Yeah, end of day Monday then to make comments about whether or not—yes, UTC, Jothan, because I think a lot of our staff are based in Europe.

And Marie, I agree, not really but I'd rather be cautious given that our chairs not here and not everyone's on the call.

Okay, so though we have nothing else to raise on that item then we can move along to the content of the report, please. Sorry, do we have the agenda up on screen, pretty please?

EMILY BARBARAS: Hi Sophie. Sorry, I'm just having a little bit of a screen share issue. I will be right there…

SOPHIE HEY: All good. I understand.

EMILY BARBARAS: There we go.

SOPHIE HEY: Thank you so much. That's greatly appreciated.

EMILY BARBARAS: I also have a PowerPoint slide for this item once you finish introducing it.

SOPHIE HEY: Super. So, as you will recall from the Wiki page on this particular item for the SSC, we've been asked by SG and C leaders to prepare a report on our thoughts for how the EOI process should be conducted moving forward and to appoint community representative group members in the future. So, part of that there are a few questions raised in the guidance document that we were provided by SGC leaders. And so now we're going to need to look at what we want to put into that report.

So, could you pull that slide up please, Emily? Perfect. So here I've got set out the questions that the leaderships decided and have come from the guidance document that we'll need to be discussing in the report. So, should additional materials be required are other SSC standard processes and practices sufficient. If not, should we have any more? Are we in a position to conduct those extra activities and will we need any additional

guidance needed from SG and Cs to support future selection processes? So, they're the main points that we've got at the moment.

At this point I'll open it up to everyone, staff included, for whether or not there's any other issues that we think should be included in this report. So, we'll start off by making sure we want covered and then we'll open it up to the different questions and trying to get some answers for that report.

Okay, great. So, I'm seeing in chat Jothan's asking about the first question: should additional materials be requested as part of future EOI processes? Great. Okay. Are there any other questions that anyone thinks need to be covered in this report? Okay, thanks, Peter. Just seeing whether or not remains if no candidate submits an EOI after reopening of the call. So, Peter, that's something that we'll consider in the next agenda item if that's okay with you? And Craig, I see a hand.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Thanks, Sophie. So, yeah bullet #1 addresses—and I don't want to repeat everything I said a few moments ago, so I won't—my concerns. If bullet #1 is done more thoroughly then the answer to bullet #2 is that I think the standard process in practice is sufficient not only for this type of appointment but I think in general for what we're slated to do. And it certainly would be nice to keep open the possibility of an additional mechanism if we feel it's really warranted. But it seems like a really in-depth and thorough EOI should give us everything we need to be comfortable in making a

recommendation and I don't know that I have any feedback on the third bullet at this point.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay, super. Thanks, Craig. Okay. So, that was a great segue, Craig, because now we can go straight into content and any thoughts that people have on answering these questions. So, Craig said EOI is crucial—paraphrasing here—and that we need to make sure we have a thorough EOI and I think that also reflects on some of the comments we've seen on list and in the poll about needing more information overall and during the call as well.

So, does anyone else have any—so for example, now would be great if people could suggest if they think there are certain mechanisms that could be used. For example, is there support for a questionnaire that would be attached to EOI targeting different criteria? Are there any types of additional practices you think might be useful at all moving forward? Sorry Craig, is that a new hand or an old hand?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: It's an old hand but I was just about to put up a new hand so I'm glad that it was there. Sophie just talked about an additional questionnaire being attached to the EOI. I'm not sure I really understand that. My point earlier is if the EOI form mirrors the qualifications and expertise that are specified in the terms of reference—and I think there are four or five specific bullets in the TOR for the CRG. If those were in the document, I'm not sure what additional questions we would need but I'm also not

presupposing that others have feedback that might be really beneficial.

SOPHIE HEY: No, I was more suggesting that the questions would be how do you think you would address these criteria in pulling them out individually, sort of like we do for the fellowship call for expressions of interest. That'd be there. Does that make sense? Jothan?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Sophie, it does make sense and I actually wanted to move towards something that Peter wisely raised in the chat which is there's the case where the call goes out and nobody submits, or we're light on the number of candidates. I think we're seeing that manifest all too frequently. So, do we have an opportunity to put in suggestions on that as part of this process? Things that might help elicit better volunteer participation.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay, so that's a good point. So, for example, we could maybe put that kind of thing under additional guidance needed from SG and Cs. For example, what to do about that. I'm sorry I'm seeing Emily with her hand up.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Well, I had a follow-on thought before handing it on to Emily. One thing that frequently I am asked as the representative from the

Registrar Stakeholder Group when volunteer positions come up that are being reviewed—and this is a horrible thing to say but I think it's pretty pragmatic because people ask—for example, if there's travel support. Or other things tied to it and what are the qualification groups so that they understand if they could even qualify to volunteer.

So, on the one realm, they're asking about maybe what are some of the perks or benefits of participating. The other is how to narrow down whether or not they're qualified or would be potentially included. Thank you.

SOPHIE HEY: So, I'll jump to Emily, and then I'll come back to you if that's okay Jothan? Emily, go ahead.

EMILY BARBARAS: Thanks, Sophie. So, I just wanted to recap for us what we're hearing from the staff side as we'll be I think potentially helping to draft some of this. It sounds like we're hearing 1) that it would be helpful to have a more detailed EOI form potentially with a breakdown of specific questions about individual qualifications that are included in the terms of reference.

It sounds like potentially the call for expressions of interest it might be helpful for that to also be more detailed in terms of things like both what's expected and maybe a more concise way of candidates but also what they can expect in terms of things like travel support compensation—I mean, obviously, most positions are volunteer but I think a lot of standard calls for volunteers in the

EN

ICANN environment have these categories that include things like qualifications but also things like travel compensation, expected time commitment, all of that broken down. So, maybe it would be helpful I'm hearing to have something a little simpler in terms of that, so people know what to expect when they sign up.

And then potentially some guidance about what to do if there are not really a sufficient number of candidates or a sufficient quality and number of candidates to fill the pool of candidates to consider. And I think that's an individual question for this process that could be considered in the report back to SG/Cs but may also be a broader question that we've discussed in the context of other selection processes.

And since most of the selection processes are guided by the GNSO Council—and this one's a little different because it's been handed down by the SGs and Cs—it may be that we have multiple conversations right, one specific to this and maybe one that's more general about assignments handed to the SSC. If I got any of that wrong, please let me know, and otherwise, I'll pass it back to you Sophie. Thanks.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks, Emily. No that sounds like a really good summary of what I've heard so far on the call at least. If anyone has any comments on that they're more than welcome to raise them. Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, actually this is a very good discussion but actually is related to any kind of selection mechanism within ICANN or even outside,

as well as any voluntary position that can be under consideration. The problem with this pandemic is that we are still using the same procedures of selection of no compensation with these voluntary positions and that is one of the reasons because some people see travel as an incentive of meeting people and making connections. And even that is not there these days and I see not even here but in other positions, these people are less and less volunteering for positions—they have to do work for nothing.

And also, this voice should be heard and should be communicated to the relevant people that they must come up with some alternate mechanism—for example, some kind of compensation they make during the pandemic until these meetings go virtual or remain virtual, something like this. This is one of the reasons we have less and less candidates.

The other reason is I see that these positions as they come, they are not well announced, and even when they're announced, it is understood implicitly that people who might be the potential applicants or the future of ICANN to contribute, it is taken for granted that they know everything about that position. So, it is just a small call, a small paragraph that we write indefinitely with some verbiage where people have to dig in to get more information, things like that. So, that does not allow more and more people to self-qualify or to self-evaluate whether they qualify for these things or not.

I think we need to pursue these positions more by asking the constituencies—the SOs and ACs—to keep encouraging people to apply whatsoever for these positions. Just like the NomCom pursue people and ask and encourage the relevant people to

apply. I think that would be great if something like that we can do. Thank you.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks, Naveed. So, from what you've said and also what I'm seeing in the chat is there's really two issues here. The first one is about the processes and procedures that we use for the SSC and the problems we've had in attracting people to come forward for this particular role. And then again, whether to have a second EOI. That's one issue.

But there's a second broader issue about attracting volunteers for any position during the pandemic and also in general when there's a lack of incentives or even [inaudible] when incentives aren't set out clearly in an EOI. So, if possible, I'd like to avoid conflating the two if at all possible.

And to answer Craig's question, likewise, I haven't been to a face-to-face or heard of a face-to-face SSC meeting, but I don't know about before that.

So, what I'd like to suggest on the participation—thanks Emily, SSC has not met in person. What I'd like to suggest is that we keep the issue of incentivizing volunteers separate from this particular task of the SSC report to SGs and C leaders on the community representatives' group, if that's at all possible. Now that might mean that SSC considers writing a letter to GNSO Council outlining our concerns and what we think could be done. For example, identifying—Craig I'll answer that travel support in a second.

So, identifying different incentives. For example, when a pandemic isn't running, travel supports when incentive. The second one, I don't know being able to go, "This is the benefit. This is the thing that you get to tell people you've done. This is how it pads your resume." Particularly for younger people I know that that can be an incentive.

The travel support, Craig, I think that's just a discussion as an example of the type of incentive that can encourage people to apply for volunteer roles. And of course, meeting ICANN staff is always lovely, as Jothan says.

So, for this one here, I'd like to focus on the second question. Do we believe the SSC standard process and practice where we rely on enrichment materials, do we think that's appropriate for appointing people to the community representatives' group? Or do you think we need to consider interviews or references? Anyone have any thoughts on that? Peter?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yes. I put something on the chat, and I'd like us to put that forth as well when we are receiving the EOI. Then there needs to be something like case scenario questions regarding the rules that SSCs considering. So, that will help us to actually make a good decision and evaluate a candidate based on [inaudible] to the roles that we're looking for. So, that's just my contribution. Thank you.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks, Peter. I'm going to push a little bit further on you to try and elaborate. What kind of case scenarios would you want to hear about for applicants on the community representative group? What kind of scenarios would you want to hear about to help inform your decision?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, thanks for that. Just thinking out aloud, just maybe any roles because, for example, when we're appointed for any role then they're some tasks that they will fulfill, then maybe they'd make descriptions of that role we can, or the ICANN staff, can put out or coin how some things of job descriptions for the candidates or to explain or to expatiate on, rather than asking them what they're [inaudible] on one's skills or the other. So, that's just what I mean. Okay? Is that helpful?

SOPHIE HEY: That's super helpful. So, what I'm hearing there is—forgive me, I've graduated university within the last 5 years, so I remember during that time being drilled with a lot of how to answer application questions. And one of the things we were strongly encouraged to do was use the star method, where we'd actually set out what the task was, the action we took, and the outcome. So, we had to clearly give examples for responding to selection criteria and job interviews. So, potentially, when we do put out this—if we were to use an EOI questionnaire to respond to different criteria, we'd ask for specific examples for how people have done this in the past. Is that what you're suggesting Peter? Sorry to put you on the spot again. And you're also welcome to

just tell me to wait a bit longer and you'll think about it for a while, and anyone else is welcome to jump in—yes, Peter, go ahead.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, thank you. Yeah, okay. Let me just create a scenario. For example, we're interviewing or considering people for a CEO position. Then I will look at the kinds of tasks the CEO is going to do. Yes, then I'm going to create how we solve this particular problem. If you are considered the CEO, how do you solve this particular problem. I don't know if that's ICANN's style of selecting people but we're just thinking out aloud on some things or mechanisms that can help us to select the right candidate for the ICANN position. So, that's just what I meant. I hope that's clarified a little in that regard, okay?

SOPHIE HEY: Yep. No that helps. So, Emily's saying that it sounds a bit like a case study assignment?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yes, exactly. It's just the word then that is actually different. Case study, yeah. Thanks for that Emily.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay, so I'd float that and ask people generally whether you think a case study assignment could be helpful for assessing a candidate in a selection position because remembering the roll of the representatives on the community representatives' group is

going to be appointing IRP standing panelists. And I like what you're thinking, and I think it's a useful tool, but the question I'd ask is how useful it is going to be for someone who's going to be doing a version of what we're currently doing here?

Again, it's not that it's a bad idea at all, Peter. I think it's a really great idea of thinking of different approaches. I'm just wondering if anyone has any thoughts on that at all. Okay, everyone is super quiet today. I'll leave that one then. I'm also conscious of time, so the other thing I'll do is I'll ask do you think in the future we'll need any additional guidance from SG and Cs to support selection processes for the community representatives' group? Just last call if there are any comments or thoughts on this or do you think the guidance document they've provided is sufficient? Jothan?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Thank you. Yeah, I mention this to build upon what Peter had mentioned. I think with respect to these roles, it may be less the case, but I found that there are some generalist types of questions that we might have and then there might be things that are very, very specific to the role that might help be demonstrative of specific skills or specific situations or experiences related to the specific tasks.

So, if it's a technical role, what are some of their technical accolades? If it's a policy role what are some of the successes that they've had in policy? And helping us understand the scoping and context so that we might even be able to curate our review questions before forwarding them on, just so that they're more honed towards those specific roles.

SOPHIE HEY: So, more role-directed questions?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Absolutely. Thank you. Very concise, perfectly worded.

SOPHIE HEY: No problem. It's what I'm meant to do as chair today—I'll go back to being quiet in future calls. Okay then. So, what I think we'll do for the next steps—I'm going to be a pain and I'm going to ask staff would it be great if you could please collect the ideas that have come up for this, send them through to leadership and then ideally, we can then put them out to the list and try to set it out in a way that people can more easily respond and give feedback in writing.   Thanks, Emily. That way we've got a bit of time we can review, make sure everything's set out neatly, everyone can have some time to think about these questions in a bit of detail, reflect, talk to their SGs and Cs to see if they're any thoughts on it—yes, Emily. Go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Sophie. We can certainly from the staff side take a first cut at drafting a document based on today's discussion and some of the points that were raised. It did occur to me as folks were talking that there might be one more thing that could be helpful to include in the document, which is just about timing of the SSC's work.

Not everyone may have been part of this conversation, but the SSC leadership certainly was, as there was discussion about whether this assignment would be handed to the SSC leadership. There were some questions about timing and how much time would be available for the SSC to complete its work before the deadline for the GNSO to put in a recommendation for its representatives.

So, one suggestion is perhaps to just put something in the document that says that it's necessary that the SSC has sufficient time to complete any review of applications and complete its process. There are some standard timelines for the regular process but to the extent that—so that could be a guiding principle if this were simple and straightforward. But to the extent that the SGs and Cs determine in the future that they really wanted the SSC, for example, to conduct interviews, then more time would be required. It's just important to take that into consideration when providing deadlines to the SSC to complete its work.

So, I'm wondering if there are any objections to that from the staff side since we do some of the administrivia and planning around it. It's certainly helpful to remind people along the way that the group needs time to complete its work and that nobody likes to be rushed. It's a good reminder to include if that's okay with everyone. Thanks.

SOPHIE HEY: I mean, from my perspective, I don't have any objections to that, and given that staff does carry the administrative burden for it, I think that's totally reasonable to flag that. And for us as well,

particularly if selection is to happen at a busy time of year, though most of the group—for example, January, southern hemisphere; July or August, northern hemisphere and also around different cultural holidays. I think that's definitely something to flag in the report. Any other comments on that point? No—and welcome Tanya, just in time for our last topic. If we could go back to the agenda please, Emily.

Perfect. So, this last item is on whether the SSC should comment on whether to open a second expression of interest process for CRG candidates. So, this one here has been talked about for a while. I think everyone here knows about my strong views on this, but I'll do my best to remain neutral while we have this discussion.

So, given that the GNSO is in a position of either appointing a candidate or having no representation on the CRG, questions have been raised on whether to open a second EOI for this. Traditionally, the SSC has not made comment on whether to extend different comment periods—not comment periods, I'm sorry, it's the middle of the day; I have no excuse for this. So, whether or not to extend an EOI period or not. However, I know other people besides me have strong views on this and so I'd pose the open question of whether you think the SSC should comment on whether to open a new EOI process or not? And if we do open it, then would we want any of the contents of our report to SGs and Cs to apply to a second EOI if we did recommend that?

Craig, is staff at liberty to share how many EOIs have been received collectively across SO/ACs? Emily, is that something you're able to answer?

EN

EMILY BARBARAS: Hi Craig and hi Sophie. It is possible that staff is at liberty to share that information but it's not actually something that I know the answer to. I only received the application that was applicable to the GNSO. So, I'm afraid I don't know the answer to that, sorry.

SOPHIE HEY: That's quite all right. Craig, is that something that was a precursor to something you wanted to say or just something you wanted to know? Okay, go ahead.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Yeah, so it's something that I like to know because the terms of reference calls for the CRG to have no less than 7 but no more than 15 people and it'd be good to know where we are because if we're at 15 already, or 15 recommendations, there might be some consideration on whether to do another EOI for our group. But nonetheless, I do think that since the GNSO is able to have two slots and given all of the feedback we've heard about the timing of the EOI—the initial EOI falling really within the holiday season and some other variables—that if we have a slot we ought to try and take advantage of it and try and fill it. I mean, the worst that can happen is we do another EOI and it doesn't get filled, then at least we can say we tried.

SOPHIE HEY:	Okay. So, just to clarify Craig, you would be in favor of providing feedback and SSC comment on whether to open a new process? Yes, perfect. Okay. Jothan?
JOTHAN FRAKES:	Seconded. I got it done in one word.
SOPHIE HEY:	Love efficiency. That's perfect, you're definitely trying to give us back some of the time in our day. I really appreciate that, Jothan.
	Okay, I'm conscious. Just let me see, is there anyone else who has comments to this—I know it's a small minority that I'm hearing, and I know I'm biased, but I really do want to make sure that if people have any objections to providing this comment or don't think there should be a second EOI, I really do need to hear them. Okay, I'm not seeing or hearing anything. So, at this point, I would like us to request a second EOI. Thank you, Jothan. Okay. Silence, no objection. Okay, I'm going to accept that, then, that we do think we should provide a comment on a second EOI.
	The second part of that is do we think we should ask for the content of our report or an expanded EOI if we can't get the report done in time to apply to the second EOI. Raymond, do you want to elaborate on that one a little bit, please?
	Jothan, go ahead.

EN

JOTHAN FRAKES: Well, I tried to just say seconded, but honestly, I got a lot of questions about this within the Registrar Stakeholder Group. The request that the expression of interest came across the holiday season during the pandemic, but what was even more to the point is that they didn't understand what the CRG was. They thought that this was a selection committee to select a committee to select a committee and they were confused about that. And so, I think a little more clarity about what it is would help get more people. We definitely do need to have better representation. So, on the one hand, I'm saying the rationale for why and in the latter part I'm expressing what my position is based off of the feedback I'm getting within the Registrar Stakeholder Group. There's confusion. I think once they understand it, they would certainly want a second expression of interest so that that second seat could be filled. Thank you.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay. Thank you very much for that, Jothan. That helps a lot. So, we've got some mixed feedback and I'm also conscious that the SSC acts by full consensus. So, Peter, the impact of opening a second EOI on GNSO schedules.

Emily, did you have any comment on how it would affect—or even Nathalie, I know you work with council—if there's any impact on how that could affect GNSO timelines and schedules at all?

EMILY BARBARAS: Hi Sophie. I might need a little bit more clarification on the question. So, my understanding is that we have—assuming the

EN

recommendation of Heather's name goes forward, she will join the CRG, and once the CRG is constituted it will move forward with its work. The GNSO has the option of selecting another member of the CRG but it's not my understanding that an additional process for another candidate would necessarily impact any of the GNSO's other work. But maybe some additional clarification of the question would help us tease that out a little better. Thanks.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks for that. Peter, did you want to clarify your question to help Emily respond at all?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yes, Sophie. Thanks for the opportunity. Yes, actually what I meant was if a second call [inaudible] to affect GNSO schedules then that would be good but if it's going to have an impact on the timeline, then we can also move forward because we have a good candidate. But in order for us to give room for other people to learn to be considered for this position then as well as our stakeholder group candidates to remain competitive, then it'll be good for us to go for a second call. Thanks.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay. Thank you so much for clarifying, Peter. My understanding is really as long as the second call for EOIs could be an [inaudible] subsequent appointment of any, because really, it's an open question of whether we do or do not appoint a second person, whether or not that interferes with the work of the CRG. Okay.

Based on that and being very mindful of time, what I'm going to propose—and noting that there are a number of people who are supporting a second EOI and having heard Jothan's concerns about the registrars, the concerns expressed in the registrars about a lack of understanding of the group, I'm going to propose that I draft a letter to send to the list. What we can do there is people can look at that letter, they can decide if they think there should be edits or not, and then people can sign on in their individual capacities. Particularly given –and if there's anyone who disagrees with having a second EOI, we can also include a part of that letter, which I would ask them to draft, could express their views on it. But if the purpose is, from my understanding, expressing this to SGC leadership would be to inform them based on our experiences now.

Craig, because we're not the ones deciding on a second EOI—we're only making a comment on it—that's something for SGC leadership to discuss and decide on.

The action that I'm proposing is to draft a letter which will contain the thoughts of the members of the SSC on whether there should be a second EOI. If you disagree, you're very welcome—and in fact, I encourage you—to add to that letter saying why you disagree with the views and then at the end, we can put our names and explain how the views fall.

What I'll do is I'll try and have a letter to the list by end of day tomorrow. I'm in London, so that will be around 18:00 UTC. People can view it, we can discuss it, and it may be that we decide that there's no benefit in sending a letter. That given the strong views expressed by both Craig and Jothan—and

particularly some of the concerns raised by Jothan—I'm going to suggest that we do at least have a draft and consider it. Is there any objections to that path of action? Thank you, Craig. Emily, go for it.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Sophie. I was just back channeling to get a little more information in response to some of the questions that just came up in case that impacts anyone's responses. So, for the CRG, there are two nominations for ALAC, two for GAC, and one each for ccNSO and GNSO. So, that was in response to the question about the composition although it's important to note that in prior discussions the community leaders agreed that the number of representativeness of the group is less important than making sure that there are qualified people in this particular group to make the discissions.

In response to the question about the impact of a new EOI process on timeframes, it's not clear at this point exactly whether a new GNSO EOI process would impact the CRG timelines. That's something that still would need to be discussed among the community leaders, so we don't have a clear picture of that yet.

So, hopefully, that answers some of the questions that have come up. And Craig is asking for a repeat of the questions. Two from ALAC, two from the GAC, one from the ccNSO, and one from the GNSO. I can put that into the chat.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks so much for that, Emily. What I'll do is I'll reach out to you offline, and if it's okay with you, I'm now going to extend my deadline for getting something to list to end of day Monday. I'll reach out to you and see if we can try and coordinate this letter based on the information that you've got. And thank you so much for your support.

Okay. In the last two minutes, any other business? Any other comments anyone wants to make. Perfect. All right then. Well, with that you can have one minute of your time left. Thank you very much for being so nice about me chairing. And with that, I will talk to you all later. And can we end the recording, please?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much for joining the call, everyone. This concludes today's call. Have an excellent rest of your day. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]