
SAN JUAN – GAC NomCom Working Group
Sunday, March 11, 2018 – 08:30 to 09:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

CHAIR ISMAIL: So can you please start taking your seats. We will be starting in a minute. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Good morning, I'm so happy to see brave colleagues standing here early Sunday morning. Remarkable. I thought I was going to be alone.

[applause]

Okay. I have to read a text. It's a formality. [reading]

Please remember when called upon to state your name for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much for being here this morning. Hello to the interpreters, thank you for being here, you know I love you.

So, I have proposal for this session. I have prepared a very, very short PowerPoint because I know there are new colleagues in the group. And also for those who want to review the recording of the session or for those following remotely, just a brief reminder of what is the role of the NomCom and why we have

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.

this space for participation and dialogue, this working group that reviews the participation of GAC and NomCom.

And then I would like to show you a very short document we have been working on for a while, a very short Word doc that hopefully in this meeting or near future, we agree on a version to share with the whole GAC, so if addressed and supported by the GAC we can send it to the NomCom. And I will explain briefly in a moment what it is about.

So first exchange of information and then we go to the document. If you have other ideas, please let me know.

I see you all agree with me, nobody complaining.

Okay. So those of you familiar with ICANN, you already know what NomCom is. -- representatives from the GNSO, ccGNSO, ALAC, iSSR and SSR, and also the GAC. This group of experts or members of the community have the role of selecting members from the community to participate in leadership roles in ICANN. So the important role of selecting half of the board, not all at the same time, they go into different times of the year, but half of the board is selected by this group of members of the community by the NomCom.

Three members of the GNSO, ccGNSO, and three of the ALAC -- I have to change the slide.

So how is the NomCom composed? It's 15 voting members and 3 non voting members. -- it's this one, it's always the other way. Thank you so much. I can't do two things at the same time, talk and check my computer.

So the present composition of the NomCom is 15 members. One appointed by the ase and one by the IETF. Three voting members, one GAC, nonvoting from the [indiscernible] one voting chair elect, the next period and one voting associate chair.

The GAC has a normal voting -- there was a GAC appointed member several years ago, for some reason they stopped doing that, different reasons for that and different GAC members have different views, no agreement so far to reappoint GAC non voting representative in the NomCom. But this is something we're not going to talk about this morning. We may restart that discussion in the future.

What we have agreed in the group so far is to give the NomCom some criteria for them to have in mind when selecting those leadership members of the board and the [indiscernible], so this is the document I want to review. The idea is the GAC sends to the NomCom this criteria to have in selecting the leadership positions, giving them some guidance when selecting this leadership positions.

The document is very short. We have been working with it for a while. So I am proposing working is that I will show the text on the screen and then will show the document on the screen. So we may go and review it in detail and make editing online if you think that's a good way forward.

Some members of the NomCom came to me during the Abu Dhabi meeting and surprised me and told me this document could be very useful for them, useful guidance for them to have in mind when selecting the leadership positions. So let's have that in mind. It's not only an idea that came from us from the Working Group but also it's something that the community may find useful.

Comments, questions? Nada? Okay. So the following slide is the text that I copied and pasted in a PowerPoint, and then the same text I will show in the Word document so we can maybe go and edit it. So I will read it.

[reading] [refer to slide]

This is a reference to advice given from the board to the NomCom and the group thought it was a good idea to reinforce this advice sent from the board to the NomCom. We may open the link but I think we agreed before this was okay for the GAC endorsing the recommendations from the board to the

NomCom. Then if we have time we can open the link and see that, but it's quite clear.

So I will go to the next one. This is our text. [reading] [refer to slide] this means the GAC would have members selected by the NomCom that have experience working with the public sector, national, local governments, the [reading] [refer to slide]

So the rationale is have members of the board and other leadership positions that have experience not only from the private sector related with Internet and coordination of the Internet but also in public sector experience. I will read all the text. [reading] [refer to slide]

This is the text. So the rationale is not only experience in the public sector, but it could be advisable to have someone with experience in building consensus and being accustomed to work in [indiscernible] environment, which is sometimes not so frequent. So that's something we found useful, and this is the text that we have to finish if we have the time. And there are also comments in the Word document.

And I think this is the last one [reading] [refer to slide]

This is the comment from the Word document. And I will read it afterwards.

So these are comments from the word documents. You see it's a very short document. I will go to the Word document and review in detail with you, if you will allow -- stop sharing.

Julia, I need you. She comes and she knows everything. I want to show the Word document. Should I open here? Share my screen? The Word one. Yay! Okay.

This is the document, we have been working on this document for a while. Unfortunately, during the Abu Dhabi meeting this session conflicted with other sessions so we suspended it. We couldn't meet as a Working Group during the inter-sessional time in between meetings because all of us were very busy and couldn't find a good date and time to meet, so we are restarting working with this document.

The first part is just a reference to advice from the board to the NomCom. I think it's okay to include it unless you have any comments. We can open the link in the bottom of the document afterwards if you want to review it or you can check it. I sent the document to you. Maybe I can open it now. Let's see. Yes, it opens.

So this is guidance from the board to the nomination committee and we thought it was okay to include it because we thought it was good guidance. If you want me to go through the document -- I think it's quite self explanatory. And if you allow me I will

move into the parts of the documents we have produced apart from this reference. If you want to review this link after, that will be okay. Now I lost my document.

Okay. So let's go to our text which is this one. Experience of working with or in the public sector including with national or local government, public authorities or inter governmental bodies. Do you have any comments? Any additions? Do you want to delete it, modify it, do you think it's okay or not? We have time.

You see that it makes reference to public sector in general. National local government, local government is fine and also there is this reference to the international experience and availability to work in an international environment which I think it's important so both are included in the document. So I think that one complement the other one. So do you think that's a good text? Just reading the first part, the one that is in bold. Maybe I can put it bigger.

Can you see it there? Experience please, English not my first language. If you think the English can be enhanced, please let me know. [reading] [refer to slide]

Nigel.

NIGEL CASSMIRE: The word after including is not required because it's one continuous sentence --

OLGA CAVALLI: Experience of working --

NIGEL CASSMIRE: With or in the public sector. I'm saying all that needs to be done, the word with that comes after including, the word with that comes after including, is not required.

OLGA CAVALLI: So including -- okay. Thank you for the good English. So for the moment we have this change. [reading] [refer to slide] Any comments to Nigel's suggestion? Nada? Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO: Good morning. My English is not that good either.

We cannot be sure if it would be ensuring the good understanding. It would contribute to a better understanding perhaps, contribute.

OLGA CAVALLI: So experience in working or interacting with governments -- what did you say?

JORGE CANCIO: Would contribute to --

OLGA CAVALLI: To a good understanding by the board of GAC input which represents the view of concerned governments and intergovernmental bodies. Thank you, Jorge, your English is good. Comment to Jorge's suggestion?

So I will read again the full paragraph with the rationale [reading] [refer to slide]

Comments? I don't remember your name, so sorry. Please state your name so I can remember it.

PAUL (indiscernable): Would like to suggest in the rationale it should say interacting or working with governments or public authorities. Because the criteria is about both government and public authorities, so the rationale should be consistent with that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Paul, apologies for not remembering your name. Welcome to the group. Thank you for your comments. Is the suggestion made by Paul acceptable?

[reading] [refer to slide] good suggestion, because maybe you didn't work with governments but contributed to the work of public authorities. [reading]

Further comments, further additions, deletes, suggestions? Okay. I see none so let's go to the second -- no, to the third paragraph.

It has comments from previous versions to the right side -- I don't know if you can see them very well. I think that's better.

So it says an understanding and appreciation [reading] [refer to slide] this has been modified several times. There was a suggestion made in the last meeting by Manal that we had to review the text as before, and the rationale for it is experience with public private partnerships and [reading] [refer to slide]

And we wanted to include something more that would ensure something as part of the rationale so the idea of this part of the text is this candidate should not only have experience in the public sector but in working in a multi stakeholder environment, sometimes different from what governmental people do. So we thought it was important for the GAC environment, and this is still text in brackets. So your comment or suggestions welcome. The rationale was not finished because we thought the last time we reviewed it that it needed a reason why this would be needed, would ensure what. A good understanding of a multi

stakeholder environment, multi sector work, I think we have to add something at the end, and I have a comment from Manal from the last time we reviewed the text and it says: [reading]

So we can either say that this would ensure suggested [indiscernible] changes or redraft it to answer the question why this is important. I think this has been one of the paragraphs that took us more time. And as you can see we haven't finished it, so this is a good opportunity for input from you.

Let's go to the first sentence first. An understanding and appreciation of advancing the public interest through building partnerships and consensus. Does it make sense? Okay. I see no comments so I think it makes sense. Let's go to the rationale, and I need your help here [reading] [refer to slide] I think we're missing a word there that would ensure something like that. That would ensure what? A good dialogue between the stakeholders, outcome of the discussion? Suggestions, comments?

I will [indiscernible] something here and you tell me if that would make sense.

I'm just guessing some text that we can add but please let me know if you have other suggestions. One idea would be to ensure a reasonable dialogue among stakeholders -- I don't think we have to mention outcome -- and -- I would stop there.

That's my suggestion. Would ensure a reasonable dialogue among stakeholders. I wouldn't mention outcomes or anything. Would it work? Can you see there? Paul? I see you looking at the text. You speak English. You are the best reference for us, United States and also our Australian friends. Nigel?

NIGEL CASSMIRE: Am I right in looking at the useful attributes --

OLGA CAVALLI: No, we are looking at attributes that NomComs should have when selecting members for the board, for the -- especially for the board. There's the criteria when they have the pool of candidates they can perhaps have in mind that some people with public experience would be good to have in the board for understanding the concern that governments bring to the discussion. Is that clear?

NIGEL CASSMIRE: Okay. I think Jorge's comment about the word ensure -- if we have the correct attributes in the room, what it would tend to do is facilitate successful resolution of matters before the NomCom maybe. Facilitate successful resolution of matters before the NomCom.

OLGA CAVALLI: Like this? What would you include -- where would you include this text?

NIGEL CASSMIRE: Instead of ensure reasonable dialogue among stakeholders, it would say facilitate successful resolution of matters before the NomCom.

OLGA CAVALLI: I don't understand what before the NomCom means. Can you clarify that?

Nigel: it means being considered by the NomCom.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Nigel. [reading] [refer to slide]

NIGEL CASSMIRE: Well, I didn't make a comment about the what is possible and workable. The text I am suggesting is would facilitate. -- not there. After the word workable. Would facilitate -- no s -- successful resolution of matters -- well, take off before and put being considered by.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. I'd read it again [reading] [refer to slide] I think we're missing something here in between work and would, like for that?

NIGEL CASSMIRE: On the screen after the word resolution you have that matters. It's not that, it's of matters. Instead of the word that -- go on, go on. Would facilitate successful resolution of matters being considered by NomCom.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Perhaps the word instead of successful, use the word constructive.

OLGA CAVALLI: Constructive resolution instead of successful, would that be good? So we have two options here. I will read it again. [reading] [refer to slide]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Constructive.

OLGA CAVALLI: We prefer constructive instead of successful.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [indiscernible]

OLGA CAVALLI: Where?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Facilitate a constructive.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On your left side here. Sorry to recap. I think the first sentence is -- [reading] this is the guideline for NomCom. And rationale is basically the reason we are putting this guideline; is that correct?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When we have a reason to justify the [indistinct] then the last line you are writing does not seem to fit. It is not the reason. This cannot be the reason for -- we are not writing this for NomCom to justify how NomCom is going to be facilitated. What we are doing is ensuring the duty of NomCom. A guideline you must follow and in that guideline, the last line would be when selecting the NomCom members and then -- among the

NomCom members, I think this line would have been very appropriate. Here we have ensuring the first line which means [indiscernible] why do we need that guidance, the rationale must justify that. And the last line justifies facilitating --

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, I tend to agree with your comment. You suggest to delete the last part of the rationale?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It looks to me we are digressing from the rationale -- I would consider the rationale experience with public private partnerships and/or multi stakeholder processes with track record in developing a consultative approach. That's it. That's the rationale.

OLGA CAVALLI: Let me put it there. Can you remind me of your name?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Indistinct [reading] suggested making it shorter. What was said before, is that the rationale needed why we need that. So this is why this text was added like would facilitate -- so this is why the text got more complex. If we make it shorter, we're somehow repeating [indiscernible] if we only say experience with public

private partnerships and/or [reading], it's almost the same, but -
- so the rationale doesn't add a lot of concept. So why? That's
what the rationale should bring, this is why we have added text.
But I see your point.

It's quite interesting why this text it's always so complicated to
be defined. We have been working with it for a while. Let me
check if I can make a suggestion. I think -- I don't know if you
agree. I think it makes things complicated. Focus on what is
both possible and workable. I think it doesn't add much value.
What is possible and workable? Depends on each case. I don't
think it's worth to have it there and makes it complicated, but
that's my opinion.

And then [reading] until approach, we're okay with that.
Experience with public private partnership and/or multi
stakeholder processes with track record in developing a
consultative approach. That's okay with everyone. Nigel?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It doesn't say why.

OLGA CAVALLI: Exactly. The rationale has to explain why we need that. So until
approach I think it's a similar concept.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So if I may add the last line and then Nigel and [indiscernible] can correct it. So after approach -- as ICANN board is required to understand public private partnership while dealing with policies in the government sector.

OLGA CAVALLI: Let me take this out because it doesn't read well. This. As ICANN board members -- remember this is not only for board members but also for GNSO and ALAC members -- is required -- maybe we can say which is required -- to understand [reading] that's one option. The other is what we had before. So this is one option. The other is and the focus on what is both possible and workable [reading] I still have a problem with that part of the text. I would stop it at of matters. I would separate it.

So we have like three pieces of text. Yes, please, I can't recall your name.

NIGERIA: I think I still prefer the first text which says [reading] I think it works better for me like that. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. So this new text, this one -- let me get your comment. So you are okay with the [reading] that's okay with you?

NIGERIA: After the procedure that would sit at a time a constructive resolution of matters.

OLGA CAVALLI: That's a new one and then this one.

NIGERIA: Yes, thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thanks to you. That's one suggestion. The other options which is required to understand public provided partnerships [reading] and another option [reading] [refer to slide]

And we have an additional suggestion suggested by Nigel at the end. So we are adding more and more text. I would go for something not so long and complicated. I like the approach that would sit at a time a constructive successful resolution of matters. But it depends on you. I'm in your hands. Nigel?

NIGEL CASSMIREL: I agree. That would facilitate a constructive successful resolution of matters.

OLGA CAVALLI: I will read again. The rationale would be: experience with public private partnerships and/or multi stakeholder processes with track record in developing a consultative approach -- do we need the that -- would facilitate a constructive and successful resolution of matters. Do we need that or no? We don't. Would that work? The shorter version? Okay? The colleague -- would that work?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can even remove the word successful.

OLGA CAVALLI: I think that's okay. Because we never know if it will be successful. So the shorter version would work? Jorge? United States okay? Okay? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Shouldn't it be should, not would facilitate?

OLGA CAVALLI: I leave it in the hands of the English-speaking friends.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would agree [indiscernible]

OLGA CAVALLI: English-speaking friends? What do you think? Should or would?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Actually, you may put the word May.

OLGA CAVALLI: May should or would, Paul?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was going to suggest can, [laughter] just to make it more complicated. But there are many people here who speak English better than me. I had a different point, which is about ensuring that the criteria is consistent with the rationale,, and the criteria says understanding and appreciation of, but the rationale says experience. So I would suggest changing experience with understanding and appreciation of -- and then the two are consistent.

OLGA CAVALLI: So it would read understanding and appreciation of public private partnerships [reading] [refer to slide] would that be

okay? Is that accepted by the -- the first part of the paragraph? Okay. So I will delete this, and it's okay if I take this, right? And what, should, or can? I think the can makes it more straightforward. For my ears. If I hear it, it's kind of -- can it kind of more easy going. Will that work, Nigel? [reading] [refer to slide] is that okay? Paul says yes. Nigel is nodding. Other colleagues? I take silence as a yes. Okay.

Okay. So I will delete this because it's not relevant anymore, and let's move to the last part of the text. It's shorter than it looks [reading] [refer to slide] and the rationale is [reading] comments about the first sentence? [reading] I see no comments. I will take silence as agreement. Let's go to the rationale gender and [reading] [refer to slide] Bernadette?

BERNADETTE LEWIS: Diversity is very broad, and the rationale begins by restricting it to -- is it gender and --

OLGA CAVALLI: So it would read gender and linguistic are legitimate public policy goals. Is that okay? Especially when it comes to a global organization. I think that the diversity words go for the gender and -- yes, Bernadette, go ahead please.

BERNADETTE LEWIS: Gender diversity is not restricted to gender and linguistics. You have geographical, cultural diversity, yet your rationale limits it or restrict it by recognizing only linguistic and gender. So what I'm saying is we have to maintain the inclusivity -- it's not restricted to gender and linguistics.

OLGA CAVALLI: So what if we take that out and say diversity is a legitimate public policy goal. Can you use the mic? And give us your name.

CAYMAN ISLANDS: -- the pursuit of diversity, yes.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Is a legitimate public policy goal. Especially when it comes to a global organization that strives to be inclusive. Would that work.

CAYMAN ISLANDS: [indiscernible]

OLGA CAVALLI: Does it sound better? Okay. We are almost out of time. Will take this out so I will read again. Experience in the multicultural setting [reading] [refer to slide] and the rationale is: [reading]

[refer to slide] We don't have much more time, so if you have any comment now? I see none. So I have the following proposal. I will clean the document, take out the comments and the edits. So I will share a clean version with GAC and with the Working Group. And if we receive no comments in maybe one or two weeks, then maybe we can share with the full GAC and see if there is interest in endorsing this document and send it to the NomCom. Does it sound like good way forward. Okay. I take silence as yes.

Thank you very much for being early morning Sunday session with me, very constructive. And I thank you very much for your suggestions, especially for those who speak English better than me. Thank you to the interpreters, thank you very much. Let's break for some minutes and then we have the other session about the geographic names Working Group. Thank you very much.

Oh, I have to read a text to close the session. The agenda item 8 [reading] thank you very much.

[applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]