
HELSINKI – GAC Participation in NomCom Working Group Meeting
Thursday, June 30, 2016 – 08:15 to 09:15 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

OLGA CAVALLI:

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being with us this morning on the last day of a very active week so I appreciate it a lot.

We will start in one minute.

Julia, if you can upload the....

So I have prepared for you two documents. One is the work plan of the working group and the other is a PowerPoint with the summary of a content of a document you have among your materials for this meeting in the zip file.

Before taking a look at the work plan, a little bit of background, why some of us thought that creating this space for talking about the NomCom within the GAC was a good idea. And then different scenarios that we have drafted with the help of ACIG for GAC participation in NomCom. Some criteria I don't know if we will have time to go through that but it's in the document. And then we will welcome comments from you.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I would like to stress the fact that we have in the room two very experienced persons in relation with the NomCom. Yrjo Lansipuro. Yrjo. He's a very well-known member of the ICANN community. He is from here, from Finland, so thank you very much for hosting this nice meeting here, Yrjo. And he has been chair of the NomCom and member of the NomCom for -- seven years, Yrjo? Six years? And also we have Olof. You all know Olof. He is also very experienced in the NomCom, and he has been guiding me with preparation of documents and some ideas for this working group.

So we may have the chance to hear from them some different perspectives from a more experienced side.

So, Julia, can we go to the next one.

And, please, as we are a small group, we have the advantage of you can interrupt me or ask me questions in any moment. We can do that when it's a large group as well, but it's easier when it's small.

So in the present composition of the NomCom, I'm not sure if you are all familiar with this, it's a group of experts appointed by the different supporting organizations and advisory committees of the -- of ICANN.

What expressed in this is 15 voting members and five appointed by ALAC, seven by the GNSO, one by the ccNSO, one by the ASO, one by the IETF.

There are nonvoting members. The GAC has a nonvoting seat that presently is not -- is not used, is the right word in English? Is not performed. SSAC, RSSAC, and one nonvoting chair, one nonvoting chair elect, and one nonvoting associate chair.

Also, it is my understanding that the chair can appoint some kind of advisors or people that can help them -- of course, nonvoting -- helping him or her in the work.

In the Los Angeles meeting two years ago there was a new proposal that, as far as I know, it has not moved forward, maybe Olof can give us an update about that, to make it a little bit bigger and a little bit more balanced in relation to the representation of the different SOs and ACs. As you can see in the left of the screen, you have the proposed new structure, which is larger with less participation from GNSO and more participation from ccNSO. And eventually, three voting members for the GAC.

Of course, we don't even have a voting member -- we don't have today voting member, and we are not using the nonvoting, so that's something that, at that moment, we thought it could be good to discuss among us.

Julia, can we go to the next one?

So what does the NomCom do? They select half of the voting members of the board. So their mission is quite important. From where? From members of the community that send their applications.

They select three members of the GNSO, three members of the ccNSO, and three members from the ALAC. Of course, this is not every year. Every year it is three or one from each of these supporting organizations or advisory committees, but their role in appointing leadership positions in ICANN is really relevant.

And for the moment, the GAC has no say in that process and in that group.

Can we go to the next one?

One thing that, at least for me, it's important is this is the present composition, the 2015 ICANN Board geographic diversity. As you can see, it is -- it needs some help with diversity, and some -- some of us think that perhaps having more participation of the GAC in the selection process or in the process of the working of the NomCom could impact in having more diversity in the composition of the board of ICANN that half is elected by the NomCom.

Can we go to the next one, Julia, please.

So some background and some challenges of why we think that this group is important.

In the composition of the NomCom today, we don't see much equal footing for participation of governments. This happens in several parts of ICANN. This is one of them.

It is not well aligned with the multistakeholder model. Not all the stakeholders are represented in the NomCom. Some of us think that there is no governmental perspective in the -- in all the working process or I have -- we don't know because we don't have an appointed member or even we don't have a liaison or we don't have a nonvoting member participating who could report to the GAC. So we really don't know much apart from the general information that the NomCom provides to the community.

So we may think, and that's an assumption, that there is no governmental perspective in the selection, or there is, perhaps, less than needed, or, no. That we don't know.

Several members of the GAC have expressed concerns related with the rules of being confidential while working in the NomCom; that this could be a limitation for their participation in the NomCom. And maybe Olof and Yrjo can help us understanding how does this work within the NomCom.

Also, governments cannot be selected for becoming ICANN Board members. That's another issue for another group in the future.

And it is, for some of us, linked to a broader discussion related with accountability and balanced participation of governments within the ICANN structure.

Next one, please, Julia.

So this, we have drafted some -- in the working group, some different scenarios for participation of GAC. One is what we -- the situation that we have today: Retain one nonvoting position, but do not fill it. This is what we do today. We have the nonvoting position, but we don't appoint anybody, so it's like we are not participating.

We can engage more, or we still have this challenge we think it's a complicated situation in relation with confidentiality. So this is what we have today.

The second option -- Julia, can we go to the next one? Fill the vacant position; just reporting. Some appointed member from the GAC to the NomCom, nonvoting member, and reporting to the GAC. We could monitor the NomCom process. We could perhaps give, in a soft way, our thinking about the governmental perspective. And the thing is that reporting to the GAC is not

very much aligned with how the NomCom works. And this is where I would like some comments from our experienced members in the audience about the NomCom.

I will go through the scenarios and maybe perhaps Olof and Yrjo can give us some comments.

Can we go to the next one, Julia?

Then fill the vacant position and actively -- participating actively as GAC nonvoting. Having a GAC agreed criteria for the selection of candidates. That's another option. We could think about that.

So the pros would be that the discussions would have an input from a governmental perspective and, as we have said before, some GAC members have signaled that sovereignty and confidentiality could be an issue for performing this role.

And the next one, Julia, please. Do not take any position for the immediate future but submit GAC-agreed criteria. So we could develop some criteria which are the candidates we think could be good for being appointed as board members or as GNSO members or as ccNSO or ALAC members, having a perspective given by the GAC.

We have drafted some criteria that are described in the document that we sent to you. It's just a draft for your revision

and input. This could be perhaps the easiest way. That could be done fairly soon. We could develop that criteria and send it to the NomCom.

For your information, there are criteria developed by the ALAC and by the ccNSO that is taken in consideration by the NomCom when selecting the members.

The next one, Julia, please.

Well, this is about the possible new structure of the NomCom. This is something that was presented two years ago. I haven't heard about it, so maybe Olof can give us some information.

The next one, please.

About the GAC criteria. We have drafted that. We can review that. There are some advice given by the Board about the candidates. We can take that as a part of the basic criteria, and we could add other experience related with public policy and experience in governmental activities, and of course we could enhance the fact that the board and the other positions should be selected with a geographic, gender, and linguistic diversity, and we can consider also the ccNSO and ALAC criteria that already are developed and are included in this PowerPoint and in the document that I sent to you.

Perhaps Yrjo and Olof could give us some input of how the NomCom works in relation with the confidentiality and other details. Olof is saying he wants to talk. Olof, please.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you very much, Chair. Olof Nordling, ICANN staff, for the record; former support of the NomCom. In addition to the actual NomCom members, of course, there is staff support. Typically two people, and those are -- well -- well, Joette Youkhanna, and -- who is second nowadays. Well, anyway.

But I think it's important to distinguish between what you call GAC input to the NomCom which is one thing and GAC appointee in the NomCom recourse for those -- the members of the NomCom. They sign on to a code which implies that they should not act on behalf of their appointing constituency. So input to the NomCom is typically something and you see the same applies to ALAC, you mentioned that, and also for the GNSO. They provide input separately from their appointees to the NomCom. The criteria that they would like to see in the board and in their own constituency -- well, the criteria for selecting the NomCom appointees to these entities. And it then becomes what you also sign up to is the confidentiality agreement. But the confidentiality is very, very limited really. It's all about the identities of the candidates to the NomCom appointed positions

in the board and so on and so forth. Because that's kept confidential until the very, very end. Unless the candidate himself or herself declares openly that she or he is candidating for a particular position. But that's not anything that the NomCom either supports really or participates in. So that's the nature of the confidentiality and that's, of course, the reason for that is that -- to get the best candidates possible in view of the fact that some candidates may be reluctant to openly declare that they're candidating in case they get rejected. And that's a cultural sensitivity for in -- for -- for some as well. I mean, in the - - many may be -- find it -- well, it's the usual conduct that you declare that you want to be a particular -- have a particular position. But in some cases, for example, in you're employed and you're considering whether to -- you could take on that role and you don't necessarily want to declare it to your employer beforehand. Well, that's one thing. And in certain cultures it may be -- if you're applying for a position openly and then is rejected it can be seen as a face-losing exercise as well. So those are typically some of the reasons why there is a confidentiality agreement or confidentiality provision in the code of conduct. Then -- well, as to the openness, I would say that NomCom, in my experience, has become a much more transparent and are issuing scorecards or information leaflets on a regular basis about where they are in the process and so on. But, of course, never, ever disclosing candidate information.

So, yeah, well, that's sort of the introduction. Now we come to the advanced information because we've got Yrjo here. He's much more experienced and of course has already had the top position in the NomCom of actually chairing it, so I think I defer to him for further information.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Olof. Before giving the floor to Yrjo or other members of our audience, let me ask you one question. So these members of the GNSO, ccNSO, they don't report to their -- they don't report back, that's the idea?

OLOF NORDLING: Well, they may report back, yes, but not in any particular way. Of course, they know their constituency and they're free to report back about anything except the candidate identities.

OLGA CAVALLI: And what could be disclosed is, for example, a certain profile, that is a candidate that is -- I don't know, has such-and-such background -- background as a professional and is -- how much detail can you disclose? Because you said names.

OLOF NORDLING: That's a judgment call, really. I mean, you can, of course, disclose various characteristics that may more or less directly identify a certain person -- a certain individual and, well, you can't go that far. But in the choice between one that has a particular background like that and a particular background like that, yes, you can -- you can provide that information. There is a matter of choosing between those in that particular NomCom member's view but the NomCom member is not really entitled to take any instructions on going one way or the other.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Olof. Yrjo, would you like to -- I cannot see you. Would you like to add something to that?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you. Thank you very much. I thank -- thank you for this opportunity to talk about the NomCom a little bit. First of all, I want to say that I do not represent NomCom in the sense that I could speak on its behalf. So I'm just giving a sort of advice and information as one who has been on the NomCom for six years, and as it was mentioned I was -- at one point I was the chair and then the associate chair.

I think that Olof already informed you about the nature of the confidentiality, which is really the basic thing about NomCom.

That is to say, information about candidates at any stage of the process should not go out. And I would say that at least the NomComs I have been on have -- have had a very pretty strict interpretation about that. So that includes also some characteristics that could eventually lead to the disclosure of the -- of the person.

Now, that is one thing. But the other thing is the process. And I think that since 2013 our slogan has been "Process is open but later," that is to say names are secret. And we have made, I believe, quite an effort to open up the process in the sense that report cards are issued on a monthly basis or bimonthly basis to the community. And here, of course, I already see one problem that has happened with the GAC because report cards are issued to the community -- to the constituencies from where the members of the NomCom come, and I think that there is no direct way -- has not been a direct way to -- of issuing them to the -- to the GAC, GAC members. So that's, in my view, could be corrected actually immediately. So everything -- everything about the process is open, but we keep the names secret.

Then the question of what the role of the government of the GAC people on the -- on the NomCom could be. And I just give a view from the -- from inside the NomCom. I think that the -- to give a governmental perspective would be very important because even if we may have on the nominating committee maybe

people like me who has been working for the government and being actually on the GAC so still there are all sorts of misconceptions and skewed perceptions about what the governments are and what they do and they -- and reading the -- reading the CVs, every time it appears that somebody has been working for a government. There are questions, well, can they be actually -- can be -- are they still sort of in a way a governmental agent so that there a GAC representative could really make a contribution.

There's one important point I want to make here. Voting/non-voting member. This is irrelevant actually. Because both categories are members. That is to say the voting members and then the two so-called non-voting members from the advisory committees. They participate equally, on an equal footing on all discussions and in what we call the straw polling. Straw polling is the method by which the huge field of candidates is eventually narrowed and winnowed down to the final ones. And in this process the so-called non-voting members take part as equal members. The only time the nominating committee actually votes is to vote on the final slate of candidates for all positions, and there, the non-voting members are excluded. But this vote is actually -- at least every time I have been on the nominating committee, it's -- it's by acclamation. So that difference is not really relevant at all.

Last point. I think that it would be an honestly -- welcomed if the GAC would issue some criteria to the nominating committee as the board has done, as ALAC has done, and ccNSO have done. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Yrjo. Very, very interesting comments. Let me ask the both of you one question. Would -- would -- so the appointing someone, a non-voting member to the NomCom could be something that it's already set for the GAC, so it's up to the GAC to appoint someone. We don't have to go through any process of just -- just talking with the NomCom and see how the possible participation of GAC could be started; is that correct?

OLOF NORDLING:

That's absolutely correct, yes. It's open for -- to do so for -- well obviously the next NomCom. The current NomCom hasn't completely finished its work, but yeah, well, it's a bit late in the day to appoint somebody to that one right now. So I guess it would -- and then we -- the numbering on it is NomCom 2017 I guess would be the next one, which would be convened in Hyderabad. And then conduct its -- its process like is outlined until next summer, and the appointment will be done at the end of the summer -- well, northern hemisphere summer, I should say.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, because in my country it's winter. Well, this is to be decided by the GAC. But just I wanted to know that it's -- it's something that we should express interest or not. Just for your information, I had a brief meeting just walking through the corridors with Stephane van Gelder. He is the present NomCom chair. And they were very interested in interacting with the GAC in relation with GAC participation in NomCom, whichever is appointing someone or sending criteria. Any comments from our colleagues in the audience? Kavouss.

IRAN: Good morning to you, Olga and all. And thanks for the explanation that was given. First of all, there is a difference between secrecy and confidentiality. So we have to recognize that. Confidentiality -- confidentiality with a sense as it was explained is quite necessary because you cannot disclose all those informations of hundreds of candidates where the situation is not clear. It may be counterproductive. So that confidentiality is required but it does not mean secrecy. We have no problem with that.

The problem with it is equal footing. 8 directors of the 16 designated by NomCom. What is the reasons that GAC could not participate in decision-making with regard to those directors? I

don't want to go out of the advisory capacity. You mean advisory like ALAC? But why we cannot participate in that nomination? 8 of 16. And they are dealing with many issues. If you send an advice, advice goes to the board. Eight of them we don't know how they react and if they do not react correctly we don't know how to do. So this is the reason that we need to hear what is the criteria today, these days, that we have now had the biggest struggle to come up with some sort of equal footing.

But you are told that in NomCom, there is no equal footing for us.

Participations in discussion, we have no problem. Participation to a straw polling to narrow down the numbers, the issue is the last steps. Still, we don't know what is rationale that we could not have any role in that last part. So this is an important issue as equal footing. We should be convinced that we should not have equal footing, and we are not convinced yet.

It was something many years ago, but situation has changed now. So we should know what our position today. No problem in the participations. No problem in the straw polling, but the issue is equal footing. We have had this struggle that we were given equal footing and having the power to exercise the power, if we so desire. If we don't desire, okay, we don't exercise that power. Here, also would like to have equal footing and instead

we are not convinced why we are not having that equal footing.
Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kavouss. Just a comment since I have been participating in the GAC, which is many years, I have never seen active participation in the NomCom from the GAC. But I don't know if that was different. Maybe all of you remember that from before or what happened or there was before and it's not now? I don't know.

OLOF NORDLING: Actually -- thank you. This is Olof, Olof Nordling, ICANN staff again. Actually, there was participation from the GAC in the earlier days but it precedes my joining ICANN, which was in 2005 or maybe -- around that period. So it's been without a GAC representative or GAC appointee for, well, around about ten years.

OLGA CAVALLI: Manal, you want to add something?

EGYPT: Yes, I was just going to confirm that we had an appointee to the NomCom -- I think it was Jayantha from Sri Lanka for -- some time but then, yeah, he was out.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah, it was years ago. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Manal, thank you for the memory.

Finn, please.

DENMARK: Thank you for the presentation and also the two other who spoke about NomCom. What I can see and what we from the Danish side think is important is to start working on the criteria. As I heard it, it would be welcome. And other part of the community actually have put up criteria. So I think that should be our priority. Whether we should participate in the NomCom, we would at least be very hesitant that GAC is going all. It's not GAC. It's members of GAC, and that might be the problem that is only members which are not taking instructions or reporting to GAC. We have difficulty to see the need to have individual

countries sitting -- or not countries, participants sitting in the NomCom.

We -- I think we might be willing to consider whether we have one non-voting members to present our criteria and give what was said the perspective of government in an overall way. That could be something which we consider, but it's not the first choice we have. The first choice is to make the criteria. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Finn, just a clarification, question from my side. The criteria is okay. I think we are all in agreement it could be good to develop this criteria. I mean, the text is developed. We should socialize it with the whole GAC and have some feedback from the working group. So it could be a possibility that in the future we could have an appointed non-voting member. Is something that could be possible?

DENMARK:

I think that could be a possibility. I'm only saying it could be a possibility. I couldn't see the thing that we have several members -- I couldn't see we have members who have voting power. And I think if I saw the charts in the beginning, you select members to the board but you also select members to GNSO,

ccNSO, and I think on that part, I think GAC should not be involved in totality.

OLGA CAVALLI: Your point is interesting. Maybe it's more relevant for the selection of the members of the board, but it's something that we should explore.

Any other comments from the audience? Sweden.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Olga. And thank you. Good morning, colleagues. Thank you for this work. It's interesting, and it's also interesting to hear descriptions from the NomCom chair of how the work is being done. I think that's very -- very useful.

One positive thing for the GAC to participate would be perhaps to have another venue where we can bridge the understanding of what governments do and not do, to have more people understand that government experience doesn't mean you're a government agent. Even if you are working for a government, it doesn't mean you are a government agent, so to speak.

It seems there's a lot of misconceptions that could be bridged. But I also sympathize very much with what Finn said. And the devil is in the details. So it could be useful to start working on

criteria, but it's very much too early to say whether or not the GAC could or should participate in the NomCom. That's for later, I think. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Sweden.

Any other comments from the audience? Manal, sorry.

EGYPT: Thank you, Olga. And thanks for the presentation. I think with the divergent views we have, the criteria would be the most practical and quick thing to do.

I also think given what Olof mentioned earlier that if the GAC want to provide input to the NomCom, then criteria would be the only option, I would say. Because even if we appoint someone on the NomCom, then he's not representing the constituency or the committee he's coming from. So, in fact, he's participating as an individual and not on behalf of the GAC.

So if the GAC want to provide input, then I think the criteria should be the only way probably. And then we can continue discussion on further participation, if we wish. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Manal.

Kavouss and Indonesia.

IRAN:

Yes. The issue of any nominee or appointee from GAC would be difficult to talk on behalf of GAC. This is -- also we have elsewhere. This is with respect to the nomination to the CCWG. Discussion started and New Zealand put a very interesting criteria.

But what about the others? Does the nominee of GNSO speak on behalf of the entire GNSO? When it comes to GAC, the whole problem arises. But others, they don't have that problem. So let's just see what is going on. Input is something that is approved by GAC. No problem. You could have input. You could ask to have input if you don't have input.

Participations actively in the discussion is another issue. Participation narrowing down is another issue. But I don't understand why when it comes to GAC, we have these problems of -- Olof, let me finish. Let me finish. Please, kindly be patient. I know you have something to say, yes.

We have to see what is the situation with the others. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Kavouss.

I have Indonesia next.

INDONESIA:

Thank you, Olga.

I think it's a very positive point that the GAC can participate in the NomCom group and look after the nomination for many other position in the ccNSO or GNSO, whatever.

I think the more important is what you mention in the slide. That's the GAC criteria. But secondly is how it is then communicated with the rest of the GAC and being an advisory committee consisting of 160, -70, something like that, with differences in idea, differences in position of countries. Then I think it will be difficult later.

The difficulty will be as my colleagues mentioned, it's in the details. If you mention Mr. X might be okay for some countries, might not be very -- might not -- resistance -- high resistance from other countries. That's the thing that the GAC NomCom member should consider. The problem then is how it is communicated with the rest of the GAC and how the decision or the input to the NomCom can be made up as Tom Schneider mentioned yesterday. It is not the force of every GAC members. It's the commonalities of the GAC as a group. But, then, of course, it is not as easy as have said. But to find community

leaders of the GAC to support member of the ccNSO, GNSO as one is another thing.

I think the GAC criteria has to be made clear that at least the GAC member sitting there can mention to his or her GAC friends that, yes, I have followed the criteria and that's it. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Indonesia.

Olof next and Manal and Canada. Anneliese.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you, Chair. I just want to respond to Kavouss' question about why it's so different. Actually, it's not different. The NomCom rules to which every NomCom member actually signs up to is that the NomCom members should not act on behalf of their appointing constituencies. So a GNSO member on the NomCom should not take instructions from the GNSO. A ccNSO member, not taking instruction from the ccNSO. And the same thing if there would be a GAC member on the NomCom. So it's not that -- well, there's one thing that the GAC would have difficulty providing a joint -- having somebody to represent the GAC as GAC and providing GAC input and GAC position -- joint positions. But that's not really the problem here.

The problem is rather the other way around. It should not, according to the NomCom rule, be representing the GAC in that sense but is appointed by the GAC.

And that's also the reason why the ccNSO and the ALAC, they provide the criteria as a separate track in a document. It's not conveyed like, of course, anybody in the NomCom can read it out. But it's provided as a separate document. And that is the other track that we're discussing here as well to have the GAC criteria consolidated and provided to the NomCom.

I think that clarifies the matter. I hope it does, at least. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Olof.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Olga, and thank you, Olof. I think Olof already made my point, so I was just trying to clarify that given the information Olof said today, which was new at least to me, that appointees sign that they are not here on behalf of their committees or constituencies, that this already -- I mean, it ends the debate here at the GAC whether someone will be representing the GAC

or some government representing other governments. I mean, they already signed that they do not represent their committees, so this is -- I think should take this point out of the debate.

Then, as Olof mentioned also, we have two issues. We have whether the GAC would like to contribute with criteria as the GAC input, and we have whether we would like to see on the NomCom someone with government experience participating as an individual, but again, given that he has government experience, he could be sharing the same views. But again, this is a separate track. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Manal. Annaliese?

AUSTRALIA:

Thanks, Olga, and thank you for your presentation and all your work on this issue.

I agree with the comments Manal made earlier about -- and just now also, and other colleagues, about the difficulty of having, you know, a single GAC member participating in the NomCom. They're not representative of the GAC, and I just don't think that's going to be possible. I think we should focus our attention on developing the criteria that we'd like to see, sharing that with

the GAC as a whole, and then perhaps in Hyderabad we could arrange a meeting with the NomCom to discuss next steps.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thanks to you. And just for your information, I think I mentioned that before. Members of the NomCom were very interested in interacting with us. By the way, we had this idea of perhaps they could participate in a working group. Then I took this idea to the leadership team with our chair and vice chairs and we decided that not for the moment, but we could have with them a special conference call and then we can interact more closely in Hyderabad with them. They are very busy now making the final selection.

I have -- I forgot your name. Say your name.

FLORENCE LENGOUMBI:

Florence from Gabon speaking.

Good morning, everyone. I have been closely following all the comments made by my colleagues. This is a very interesting issue and we are -- whenever we talk about GAC, we always have the impression that GAC should not be actively engaged everywhere because it is an advisory committee. At this point in

time, with the work done by the working group, I think it would be interesting for GAC to set up criteria and to follow up on the work done by the NomCom by having a person who would re- -- who would participate in this group. Then we could see how GAC could reach a consensus in order to appoint one person to the NomCom.

It would be interesting to appoint a person to the NomCom to represent GAC there. I don't see how GAC could appoint a person and that person would not represent the GAC. If GAC chooses an individual, then this individual should represent our advisory committee.

In summary, I agree on participating in the definition of criteria and then I believe that we should start discussions to explore the possibility of selecting a representative of the GAC to the NomCom.

SWEDEN:

-- the floor again, but since much seemed to be hinging on the criteria and the criteria that are separately being submitted also by ccNSO and ALAC, it will be interesting to hear also from the chair, perhaps, what practical significance these criteria have, how they are -- how extensive they are, how detailed, how much of a force of walls they have and how they are used in the work. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Just before -- just before --

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: -- giving the floor to Yrjo, I just -- for you to know the criteria of others are here, if I can manage this.

This (indicating) is ALAC criteria. We won't go through this, but you have in the document that we share with you, and you have the --

It doesn't work.

[Laughter]

OLGA CAVALLI: -- and you have the ccNSO criteria somewhere in the document, and we'll stop here.

Yrjo, please. Sorry for interrupting you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:Yeah. Thank you. First of all, I would like to say that I'm not the chair of the NomCom now. I was the chair 2013. The present chair is Stephane van Gelder.

So I would say that the criteria that we are given by the board and by ALAC, by ccNSO, they are adhered to quite keenly. That is to say, it's constantly in our discussions we refer to them, and when we assess -- have assessed the candidates, so this -- they are the reference, or the criteria are important.

They are all available on the NomCom Web site, they are public, and of course afterwards, when the names are public, people can also, you know, compare and take a look whether we have followed those criteria.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Sweden. Thank you, Yrjo.

Any other comments?

So let me show you this is the ccNSO criteria. As you can see, they have a special focus on ccNSO selected candidates for the ccNSO, that they advise not to appoint members who are directly or indirectly associated with a ccTLD manager nor board members or employees of a regional organization, to maintain

balance, and the candidate should be able to commit sufficient time to ccNSO work, and for the board, they don't have special advice.

And let's see if this works. Yeah!

ALAC criteria is more detailed.

Basic knowledge of DNS; experience and skills in gathering, understanding, and communicating the interests of individual users; consumer protection advocacy; Internet-related policy development; interest in knowledge of Internet governance issues; leadership experience in DNS activities; ability to bring new perspectives; strong local networks; ability and interest to work in a multicultural environment; time commitment; knowledge of the DNS.

So it's quite general.

My -- this is a personal comment about developing criteria, and -
-

Sabine, one second. I'll just finish and --

This -- we have worked many times in the GAC developing criteria. Then things happen differently.

One thing that I can think about is the rules for new gTLDs and all that work we finish in 2007 in Lisbon, and then the applicant

guidebook was slightly different and then things were slightly different.

So sometimes criteria is good but it not -- it doesn't reflect totally in the outcome, but that can change in the future or could be different in the NomCom.

Sabine, please.

GERMANY:

Thank you, Olga. Just to clarify, the ccNSO and the ALAC criteria you just showed us, those are criteria for selecting people that are also sent to those bodies, so to the ccNSO council and the ALAC. No?

OLGA CAVALLI:

As far as I understand -- and please correct me, Yrjo and Olof, if I'm wrong -- these are criteria for the selection of future appointees to the ccNSO and to the --

I'm saying the right thing?

OLOF NORDLING:

It's Olof here again. Yes, but, as you noted, for the ccNSO they specified criteria for the appointees to the ccNSO and they didn't say anything about appointment to the board.

Others do.

So it's really up to the constituency in question. They can have views on who should be appointed to the board and what --

And if you look carefully to the ALAC instructions, I mean, it's more general. It's about the leadership positions in a general sense.

OLGA CAVALLI:

I think the question from Sabine was if -- how these -- these members of the board -- of the NomCom are selected. I think it must be -- no, it must be a process inside each SO and AC.

GERMANY:

It was to what Olof just --

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you for clarification.

Kavouss?

IRAN:

Olga, let us be straight with ourself. Those criteria never is applicable. You can't find those people. Can someone tell me that any one of those have all those criterias? And then who will check that?

I have worked in the U.N. system for years, and we describe a job description, but this is just job descriptions. Never the candidate fulfill those.

I don't think that we should start with something like that. We should -- something practical, something that really serve us, but not saying having this, having that. You can't find that.

If you look at all those criteria written by ALAC, I never find -- maybe one. I don't know. Maybe Mr. X. I don't know the name. He did it for himself. That's all. I don't think that we should start that one.

We're making the job complex. Let us see that do we want to have some role or not. If you want, we have to make it practical, as such, but not putting complex, writing a doctor of philosophy and so on and so forth, years of university to start to be a nominee of the GAC. Representation of GAC would be difficult because we cannot agree to find somebody who represent us.

What about the others? Does they represent their constituency? No. But they have the trust and the confidence in them that they should be fair, they should be balanced, they should not pick up their own national issues and so forth. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Kavouss.

Yrjo?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yeah. Thank you.

In the board criteria, there is one or two very important words. The candidates should -- the -- or the composition of the body that is the result of these decisions by the NomCom should represent those desired qualities in aggregate. In aggregate. That is to say, the idea is not to create someone who has like the specifications for creating a totally new person. It's just to look for people who, in aggregate, fulfill these criteria.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Yrjo.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yeah. Just to stress what Yrjo said, that this is aggregate overall, so everyone can have one or two skills of this but then the aggregate thing would have -- would fulfill the full criteria.

But also the criteria, like you showed the ccNSO criteria, might also stress what we don't want to see. For example, they said

they don't want someone who is a ccTLD manager, so this is also another thing to be considered in the criteria. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

So that's a very good point. We may express what we don't want or what we -- what we expect from a candidate.

Comments? Other comments? Kavouss.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Recently in CCWG, we (indiscernible) with respect to the IRP and IRP panel and panelists are good material how they should act. They wrote down many things, and they said that some of these should be fulfilled but not all.

The panelists should be expert in some of these, and they said (indiscernible) but not all. We cannot find somebody to fulfill all of that.

And aggregate, I don't understand the aggregate. Mathematically, I don't understand what the aggregate is.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Kavouss. Other comments.

Olof.

OLOF NORDLING:

Thank you. It deserves to be mentioned as well that there -- these criteria are in addition to the baseline criteria which are defined in the bylaws, Article VI, on the criteria for selection of directors. So -- And, well, that's quite a laundry list in its own right.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. I think we have to wrap up this session. We have, like, five minutes more.

And please tell me if I am wrong.

I hear a sense of that we are in agreement of developing the criteria. The criteria has been developed by the working group. We should review them a little bit and share it with the whole GAC.

I personally think that criteria is sometimes not enough. It could be diluted in the process, but it's -- at least it's a good start for focusing on this issue.

So if I see no objections, the group could share with the GAC this draft criteria for revision. Is that a good idea?

I see no strong opposition. I see nodding. Fantastic. That's the first point.

Also, as I mentioned, the NomCom members are willing to interact more with the working group, so we can think about a conference call before Hyderabad or a meeting in Hyderabad. Is that a good idea?

I see no strong -- Yes, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I am much in favor of a face-to-face meeting rather than conference call.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, okay. Let's think about a face-to-face meeting. And also, they will have more time because they are now very busy finalizing their selection for this -- for this year.

And what else?

About the participation. I feel -- I have the sense from the room that we still have to discuss this among the GAC, so perhaps we could think about, have this in mind for Hyderabad and discuss it again.

So I would kindly ask you to think about if it's possible to fulfill this nonvoting position. I think Yrjo made -- one second.

I think Yrjo made a very interesting comment about the relevance of the voting or nonvoting. I think you made it very right in the sense that the participation in the group, as a group itself, brings value, the diversity, the diversity of vision brings value to the group, and voting, nonvoting, it doesn't mean that much.

So having that nonvoting position for the GAC is not so bad that it's nonvoting.

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thanks, Olga.

I was just going to add that perhaps when you finalize the criteria in the working group, you could also put in writing the pros and cons of GAC participation to enforce the criteria, whatever the role is that you're looking at. And identify black and white, on paper, what kind of role you're seeing.

I think that would help to have the whole GAC have a clear vision of what's the role, what it would do, and how. Because there are clearly differences in the room about whether this is a good or bad thing. And if you include that in your guidelines, not as the guidelines, obviously, but in the report of your working group, I think that would help to clarify the discussion.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. So not in the criteria itself but as an additional information for information and feedback from the whole GAC. I think this is a very good suggestion.

So interacting with NomCom.

So I think we have a way to go. If there are no more comments from the audience -- Kavouss, yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you further clarify "input." What do we mean by input? Input means that we prepare something in the GAC? We decide on that? We agree the text and send that text to NomCom? What "input"? Or do we mean the participation? The participants, whoever participate, they contribute and that contribution is called input?

So what is input? Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Where is the input word?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: You had many times input.

OLGA CAVALLI: My English is bad and it's my second language, so maybe I didn't mean that specifically.

What I meant is if the working group prepares a draft document with the criteria, and I think with the good suggestion made by the European Commission about other concepts that should be reviewed by the GAC, we could share this document with the whole GAC. I didn't say input. And maybe we can have feedback. Maybe that's the word. Not input. Feedback.

Yes, please. Singapore?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No. Panus (phonetic) for the record.

I'm just thinking about if you show the scenario already, is my contribution think about, in this scenario to show pros and cons. And if you let think about the criteria, it might be to drawbacks on these pro and cons.

For example, you said that for the nonvoting, it might be three or four those nonvoting, this might be actively participations, some kinds of thing. So it's why it might be easy for you just to set the scenario on one and two, this is the criteria for those people on scenario one and scenario two. It might be easier for you to think further what you're going to do.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Let me see if I understood you correctly.

My understanding is that we should draft some criteria for the present scenario which is filling -- not filling nothing. It's just providing some criteria to the NomCom.

So we are not talking already yet about filling the position or not. Just giving criteria. Is that what you mean?

Thank you very much.

Any other comments?

Okay. I will summarize what we have discussed today with my notes and with the transcriptions, and we will work in the work group in this draft criteria and we will share it with the whole GAC, and with the good suggestion by our colleague from the European Commission, other ideas to be included in the document. I promise it will not be too long.

And we will share it with the GAC perhaps in one month time.

Thank you very much for being with me this morning, and have a good rest of the day.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]