HYDERABAD – GAC WG to examine GAC's participation in the NomCom meeting
Thursday, November 03, 2016 – 10:30 to 11:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you all again. This is me. Yes. Sorry. This is Olga Cavalli again.   This will be the meeting of the working group, GAC working group on -- that analyzes the participation of GAC in the NomCom. Allow me one second to find my pen.

So the idea of the meeting is to give a short background to those new members in the GAC or those that are recently interested in the -- in the focus of this working group and then we will analyze the document that has been included among the material that (indiscernible) the GAC secretariat has prepared and sent to all of you. Which has different scenarios for GAC participation in NomCom and we will focus a little bit more on which criteria could the GAC perhaps send to the NomCom as a first step towards increasing or improving our participation in the NomCom for those selected candidates by NomCom. And then we can talk a little bit about next steps.

Doesn't work.

Julia or -- Can you -- Can you move to the next one? Because I cannot do that from here. Thank you so much.

So why are we gathering in this working group and why do we -- thank you so much -- are we interested?

So what is the NomCom? How many of we know what is the NomCom? The NomCom is a group of experts gathered from the different SOs and ACs of ICANN that -- they're appointed by their different SOs and ACs, and they select half of the Board. They select also some members of the GNSO, the ccNSO, and the ALAC.

So they have a very important role in selecting this members of this part of the ICANN structure.

So how it's composed today, the NomCom? So in the slide, you can see where it says present, the present structure of the NomCom is 15 voting members, five from the ALAC, seven from the GNSO, one from the ccNSO, one from the ASO, and one from the IAB. And there are three nonvoting members, one from the GAC, one from the SSAC, and one from the RSSAC, one nonvoting chair, one nonvoting chair elect, and one nonvoting associate chair.

I would like to stress the fact that this GAC nonvoting seat has not been -- has not been -- how do I say in English? Used is the right word in English? Sorry. So GAC is not sending a nonvoting participant to the NomCom.

So we have no -- no participation in the NomCom for the last -- at least for the last years. I have been participating in ICANN for ten years so far, and I don't recall -- maybe I'm wrong, but I don't recall the GAC sending a representative, whether nonvoting or not, to the NomCom, but perhaps other colleagues here that have a better memory than me can help me.

Also, there is a -- there was a group analyzing the structure of the NomCom that presented their outcomes in the Los Angeles meeting in 2014, and there is another proposed structure. This is not implemented yet, but it's -- so it's not only the GAC that is analyzing this but also the Board has considered that perhaps this structure of the NomCom could change.

So the proposed change is the following. Five members for the ALAC, four for the GNSO. This is a change for the GNSO. Five for the ccNSO, five for the ASO, one for the IAB, IETF. And they propose that the GAC could have up to three voting members, depending on what the GAC decides. Could be one, two, or three. And members from the SSAC, RSSAC, and IETF. And also the nonvoting chair, the nonvoting chair elect, and the nonvoting associate chair.

So as you can see, the proposed change in the structure is -- it -- tries to bring more balance in relation with the representation of

the different SOs and ACs. So this is -- this was presented in the Los Angeles meeting, but it's not implemented yet.

Can you move to the next one, please, because I cannot do that from here. Thank you.

So what does the NomCom do? They select eight members of the Board. Not at the same time. Every year they select two or three, depending on the timing. And three members of the GNSO, three members of the ccNSO, and three members of the ALAC. Depending on the year, you will see they select one or two or three.

Thank you. Is it me that I cannot use this or....

Okay. Let's see. Yeah. It worked. Thank you so much.

So the challenges for this analysis, do we have equal footing for the participation of governments in the ICANN structure? Should we have representativity in the NomCom or not? Should we abide to the multistakeholder model that says that all stakeholders have a say?

The governmental perspective, how can we select members of the Board or members of other SOs and ACs selected by NomCom, that -- how can we measure if they have governmental experience or if they can include their

governmental perspective if there are no governmental representatives in the NomCom?

It seems that there is a limitation that has been raised by several members of the GAC that is related with level of confidentiality requirements for GAC representatives in NomCom. As you know, it's a process that selects candidates, and it requires some confidentiality and secrecy about the names of the different candidates. And this seems to be a problematic for some members of different governments. So this is something to analyze. It could be a barrier for participation of governments.

And of course this is all linked to a broader discussion about accountability and balanced participation of governments within the ICANN community in general.

So what we did. There are several documents that are shared with you. We did analyze different scenarios for GAC participation in NomCom. The first one is what we do today. So we have the nonvoting position and do nothing. That's -- that's what we do today.

The second one would be fill the vacant position and just report to the GAC. Some one of us -- so the GAC decides that some representative participate in the NomCom meetings and we have some reporting for them, feedback and back and forth information in between NomCom and GAC. This is not

happening now, but could happen because we have the nonvoting seat in the GAC, if the GAC decides so.

Another possibility, the third one, would be film the vacant position and participate actively and perhaps decide among the GAC some criteria that this nonvoting member appointed by the GAC in the NomCom could bring to the discussion.

It is my opinion -- I've never participated in the NomCom, of course, but it is my understanding that a nonvoting member can also perhaps participate in the discussions and in the deliberations. Nonvoting, but actively participate.

And the fourth option, which is the one that I would like to analyze now with you is we don't take any position for the immediate future but we could prepare some agreed criteria from the GAC perspective and send it to the NomCom. This is something that other SOs and ACs have done. I will show you in this presentation the criteria sent from the ALAC and from the ccNSO.

So what's the -- what is their expectation in those members of the ALAC and the ccNSO and the Board and the GNSO selected by the NomCom? What are they -- the skills that they are interested in these candidates to have, how they should behave?

So what I would like to focus now is some document, some text that we have prepared in relation which possible GAC criteria that we could send to the NomCom as a first step of involvement in between the GAC and the NomCom. This is not -- not using the nonvoting seat, not participating in the meeting so far, but sending to the NomCom some GAC criteria.

Any -- Any questions so far? Kavouss.

IRAN: Yes. I think there might be other possibility that sending the criteria, but the nonvoting be present and, first of all, explain the criteria, defend the relevance of criteria, legitimacy of the criteria, and so on and so forth. Otherwise, they may not be taken appropriately. That would be one -- one possibility. Still we are nonvoting. We are attending. Not only reporting back but also, if we succeed to have criteria, we explain the criteria and defend the criteria and make sure that the criteria are taken into account.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kavouss. Before giving the floor to Manal, perhaps this is the number three, fill the vacant position and actively

apply that criteria. That could be the number three of the possibilities.

Manal.

EGYPT: Thank you, Olga. Just very quickly to note that we used at one point in time to participate, yeah, in NomCom. I recall Jayantha from Sri Lanka, he was participating at the NomCom, and then the GAC ceased to participate for the reasons you already mentioned.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: And, Manal, if you can share with us. The experience was positive? Well accepted? Or how was the -- I don't recall that. When was that?

EGYPT: Actually, I was not deeply involved. I think he used to be reporting back to the GAC, and in some cases he said this is confidential, and he cannot really disclose all information, and this is where the discussion started. But I can't remember the details. Maybe we can reach out to him. He's still on the GAC,

but he has been -- he didn't come for quite some time. But maybe we can seek his experience.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: That's a very good idea. If you can share it to me, the details, we can reach out to him. Yes.

I was going to say something and I forgot.

Can you tell me your name? Because I cannot see you very well from here.

COLOMBIA: Hi, Olga. This is Jaifa from Colombia. I wanted to ask when would these measures, if we decide to participate in NomCom, take effect?

OLGA CAVALLI: Well, that's a very good question. It's up to the group first to agree on something; then we should present it to the GAC and see if the GAC agrees. And if the GAC agrees, then we can contact the NomCom.

Just for your information, we have got in touch with the new NomCom chair, and he -- he is interested in meeting with some

members of the working group during the -- this Hyderabad meeting. He was not sure about his agenda, so maybe if some of you want to join me, just an informal talk.

My perspective from some informal conversation I had with Stephane Van Gelder who was the past chair of the NomCom for two years, they are interested in having the GAC actively participating. So that's something. It's more up to us, up to the working group in producing something and present it to the GAC, and the GAC to decide, of course, as a whole.

But thank you for your comment, and sorry I don't see you very well from here.

Hola.

More -- You want to respond. Yeah, sure.

COLOMBIA: Yes. I have another question. What is the extent of the confidentiality? Because I think that that would make us make a better decision.

For example, if the confidentiality extends to the Board of the GAC, so it would help us, I don't know, make better decisions after the meetings of the NomCom.

OLGA CAVALLI: That's -- Is Olof here in the room? Because he's our expert. He worked for the -- for the NomCom many years, and he already explained that. And I think it's about the names of the candidates.

You want to add something to that, Kavouss? Please, go ahead.

IRAN: Yes. The confidentiality is for the period before the nomination is made. Candidate comes, names of candidate are before the group. They evaluate their capacity, qualification, and so on and so forth. Before final decision is made, this should remain confidential; otherwise, the whole thing will collapse. So there is not confidentiality as such, but it is something embedded and it is a practice everywhere. Before you make a final announcement, you don't do that. That's all.

So there's no closed circuit. This is something open, but this confidentiality until the final selection is made. Otherwise, the issue may be affected adversely. That is the situation.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kavouss. And adding to your question, Jaifa, and we can ask for more clarification from Olof, he is an expert in that,

the thing is that we participate in GAC not as persons. We represent governments. So that's the -- that's the complication.

We would be in that group in the representation of the government, and then the relationship in between the government and the representative is -- may require some disclosement of the information. That's complicated, and we have to work on that.

And we can ask Olof about that detail.

Yes, Manal.

EGYPT: Yes, just very quickly to add to what Kavouss rightly mentioned. The confidentiality has to do with the candidates in specific, and we already heard from the NomCom that this confidentiality helps them get better calibers because sometimes if things are -- everything is public, some people may refrain from nominating themselves.

So candidates, their names, their calibers, even the votes are not public, and we just get to know the results. We don't even know who was running for -- who was nominated and did not make it. So this is confidential. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:	So we don't know the name of the pool of candidates; just the outcome. Thank you, Manal, for the details.

So the purpose of the next 20 minutes is if we can think about agreeing some criteria and send it to the NomCom, that would be a first step. No involvement, if the GAC doesn't want to or if we still have doubts about it, but we might send somebody. As we our distinguished colleague from -- the (indiscernible) coming from Iran mentioned, it would be good to have someone there to insist that the criteria could be taken in consideration, but that's something that the GAC has to decide.

So let's focus on the criteria and we have prepared and I will share with you.

GAC criteria. Draft GAC criteria. And then I will show you the criterias from the ccNSO and the ALAC.

Personal qualities and experience identified by the ICANN Board in its advice to the NomCom of October.

I will show you the criteria in a second, identified by the NomCom -- by the Board advice to the NomCom.

Manal made a very interesting question in the list, if there is another source of different qualities, advice to the NomCom apart from this one from 2014. I had no time to investigate it. We may ask Olof about that. He's very experienced.

So these are the criteria. Accomplished person, integrity, objective, and intelligence with reputation and sound judgment and open mind. Demonstrated capacity for thoughtful group decision-making, person with an understanding of ICANN mission and the potential impact of ICANN decisions on the global Internet community, committed to the success of ICANN. Persons who will produce the broadest cultural and geographic diversity on the Board. Persons who, in the aggregate, have personal familiarity with the operation of a gTLD registries, registrars, ccTLD registries, IP address registries, Internet technical standards, protocols, policy development processes, legal traditions, public interest, with a broad range of business, individual, academic, and noncommercial uses of the Internet.

It's quite broad, but it's desired that the members, especially the Board, have these qualities. This is what this advice from the Board to the NomCom includes. It's a summary, but you can find. In the link below, you have all the details.

Another GAC criteria could be a record of achievement in the public sector. It doesn't have to be -- you know a member of a government cannot be part of the ICANN Board, as the present bylaws establish that, but it could be someone that have previous experience in the public sector or someone, some candidate that had a relationship with working with governments, which is a different dynamic than working with

private sector or civil society, including with national or local governments, public authorities, or intergovernmental bodies.

Length of service is a better criterion for quality candidates. This could occur at different roles in the government, given the significant responsibilities of regional and local government in some countries.

So having some public sector experience, not necessarily being a member of a government, but knowing about how the governments work.

Other criteria. Understanding and appreciation of advancing the public interest through building partnerships and consensus. Experience in the political processes, advisor, participant, tends to develop a consultative approach and focus on what is both possible and workable. So experience in interaction, negotiations, and building partnerships is desired, or could be desired.

And another interesting draft criteria is consider all aspects of diversity. The bylaws include geographic and cultural diversity as criteria for Board composition. Gender and linguist cities diversity are legitimate public policy goals, especially when applied to a global organization that strives to be inclusive. So all aspects of diversity should be considered.

Let me show you something. I couldn't find a more updated one. This is the composition of the Board. I think new members of the Board will be appointed after this meeting in Hyderabad, but I don't know how this will change, but we have one member from Latin American and Caribbean, three members from North America, four from Europe, five from Asia -- Australia Pacific, and two from Africa. And I won't mention the gender thing because it's not nice, it's not balanced, but that's something to work with.

So, this is -- I repeat it. So this is the ICANN Board skills suggested to the NomCom for board members. I won't go through them. They're quite obvious but it's quite interesting that they put it in a document.

And this is the ccNSO criteria. Of course, for the ccNSO it's important that they understand the -- the concerns of a ccTLD manager and a ccTLD interest at the national and regional level. So this is something important for them.

And their criteria is for the ccNSO selectee, not for the board. For the board they don't offer any specific criteria. And the ALAC criteria is -- and the leadership position which is description 2 and which is the candidates that are selected, knowledge of the DNS, experience and skills in governance, and understanding and communicating the interests of individual users, remember

the ALAC represents the users of the Internet within the ICANN community. Consumer protection and advocacy, Internet-related policy development, interest in and knowledge of Internet governance issues, leadership experience in DNS activities, ability to bring new perspectives and strong local networks, ability and interest to work in a multicultural environment. These are the expectations of the ALAC of the selectees that will be appointed to the ALAC, and for those ALAC members that will participate in NomCom is the part 1 of the description. Include one citizen of a country within each of the five regions. So as you know, the ALAC has RALOs, the regional organizations. Experience and skills in gathering, understanding, and communicating the interests of the individual users would be advantages. Basic knowledge of the DNS and type commitment, of course. Everyone that participates have many colleagues from other SOs and ACs that have -- that were part of the NomCom. And it's extremely demanding in relation of time. So that's something that whoever, in the case that the GAC decides to apply -- to send a candidate, a participant, that takes a lot of time. So that's something that should be considered.

So the question is, do we have comments for this criteria? Would it be okay for the working group to send this criteria to the GAC? You think that they should be enhanced, changed, you

have comments to that? So the proposal is a first step. Defining this criteria, share it with the GAC, and if we agree and then send them to the NomCom. No active participation for the moment. This would be a first step. And then after that we could analyze other options. So the floor is yours. Any comments to that? Finn.

DENMARK: Thank you, Olga. Two questions. Those four criteria, are they prioritized or are they on the same level. That is one thing I would like to know. Then I heard when you presented the second one, that was on achievement in the public sector and the rationale there is they did achievement and length. I have -- I cannot see that the length is important to be in a public sector. I will be pleased because then I will have a good chance to be nominated, but I don't think it's -- it's relevant criteria. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Can I ask you a clarifying question? Is the word "achievement" the one that you don't like or the idea of having someone with experience in the government the thing that you see no value?

DENMARK:	I have no problem with achievement. But I have a problem if it's how many years you have been employed. Which actually is stated in the rationale. So if it's limited to the achievement, then it's -- might be a valid criteria.
OLGA CAVALLI:	So you could perhaps take away the length of service. Would that work? So having achievement and knowledge, not necessarily length of service. I have Kavouss and I have United States. I don't know your name, but let's start with Kavouss. Kavouss.
IRAN:	I don't think that we should totally disregard the length of the period that such achievement is made. We might have some super genius -- super smart people within one month in public activities getting there, but it's too difficult to have. I think you need time. You could have some minimum, but not very lengthy, and usually that minimum would be something between three to five years, minimum. But not saying without any length of period, that would be quite unacceptable. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:	Could we perhaps put the concept of experience instead of length of service? Would that be acceptable?
IRAN:	I would say experience not less than X years.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you, Kavouss. United States, and can you let us know your name, please?
UNITED STATES:	Yes, hello. My name is Ashley Heineman. I'm the new U.S. GAC representative. So thank you for recognizing me. I just wanted to ask a clarifying question, particularly based on some of the comments made. Is this intended to be a requirement for one of the board members or is this intended to be a set of considerations to be taken into account when selecting board members? Thank you.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you, Ashley, for your question. It's a very good one. My understanding, and as I said before, we don't have experience in the GAC in participating in NomCom. My understanding is this are guidelines for the members of the NomCom to have that in mind when selecting the candidates. And please correct me if I

am wrong. That's my understanding. So it's not mandatory, but it's something that they should or could have in mind. So the comment of Kavouss previously was very interesting. It could be good to have someone from the GAC to -- just to reinforce the fact that this criteria could be considered. And thank you, Ashley, for your comment. And I have -- your comment, and can you give us your name, please.

SENEGAL: Thank you very much. My name is Cherif Dialle, and I'm representing Senegal at GAC. My question is as follows: There is a certain number of criteria of qualifications defined at RFC 3787 regarding the people that are part of the NomCom. I would like to know whether this criteria are included with this framework or if our criteria have to be more specific for this GAC member that will be part of the NomCom. Because there is a correspondence between this criteria and the criteria in RFC 3787 that mentions a set of rules for the nomination of the NomCom members.

OLGA CAVALLI: ... not familiar with this RFC so perhaps we can -- we can review them at the working group level. If you could send links to those RFCs and we can check those criterias that would be great. Would you do that with the working group?

EN

SENEGAL: Yes, of course, I will send you the link.

UNITED KINGDOM: I'd just like to go back to this discussion about criteria and years of experience and achievement. I would like to understand how are we analyzing that because I take it from Iran mentioned eight years of service and I was wondering why eight years or ten years? I mean, I suppose this is something that will be submitted to -- to the group, so being subjective as it is, since it's been -- it's been submitted to the group, the group will decide which is the experience we need the person to have. So by defining eight years or five years or ten years is more a cabalistic thing than anything else. So maybe you could help me to understand why eight years or five years or -- and not just achievement or experience widely defined.

OLGA CAVALLI: Kavouss.

IRAN: Mark, that was quite clear. Experience could not be reached without passing time. You cannot say I am experienced the first day. I think some religious people, they have this idea that in

half a second the previous religious leader give something that is yours and he will be number one and knows everything. No, it is not. You have to spend years. That's all. If you don't have that years, go to all the selections in other organizations. You see that associated, depending on the category of the post, some years of experience apart from the knowledge, apart from all of these good code of conduct that you have this years of experience. Because you need that to feel what the job is. What's the situation. But I did not propose eight nor five. I said X years. And I leave it open to the people to see what that X would be. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kavouss. Manal.

EGYPT: Thank you, Olga. First, I agree that experience is important and it has to do with the length of -- of service, but I also see the point raised by Brazil, by Carlos, that if we specify a certain number of years, this would be disqualifying criteria. If we take any number, for example, if we say eight years or whatever, then someone with seven years won't qualify, even if he's the only candidate with governmental background and again, it -- it is relative, I think. So if we have a certain number of candidates with varying experience, then probably the NomCom would go

for the most experienced but not necessarily a specific number of years. So I'm just proposing that we keep experience and again, it has to do with the length of service. But we can call it experience, as you suggested. But we don't necessarily have to specify certain number of years. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Carlos. You want to react to that.

BRAZIL: Yes. Just to point out, I think my colleague here just summarized it maybe better than I did. What I was trying to argue is that if we choose a specific or scientific kind of criteria maybe we'll make our own work harder when we choose someone. I mean, so I -- I completely agree with the experience thing and the achievement thing and the government experience. But I think since this -- this whole process will be submitted to a group that will analyze, I think maybe we should make it less scientific and maybe -- suppose a candidate will show a resume or something like that. So I think experience is okay. I think it's important. I think experience in government, achievement is fine. But I -- I would go for something less specific in order to allow for different candidates to present themselves.

EGYPT: Could we say proved experience or relevant experience or something like --

OLGA CAVALLI: Enhancing the word of experience. Kavouss.

IRAN: Madam, any adjectives would all be arbitrary and subjectives. Sufficient experience. What is sufficient? Relevant experience. Who decides that experience is relevant or not? I think you could say something but not specifying X years but saying between X and Y but some years of experience is required. I don't think that -- people should be patient, should not jump to the position without spending some time. That is -- this is the problem of our distinguished young people. They want to jump into the things. You have to spend time. To get that experience. We cannot do it in one night. No matter how knowledgeable you are. Because it is not only knowledge, it is not just theory, it is practice. You have to see cases like this. You have to have a presence like that. That is important. All of the things that is done, any lawyer in the world base on the precedence. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: What if we put a minimum like at least two years, one year, three years of experience and leave the other upper -- upper XYZ open. Yes, Milagros.

PERU: Instead of just saying a number of years, why don't you just ask the interested party to prove his experience?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, the point is that for the moment, the idea of sending the NomCom criteria, so we are not involved in the process of selecting the candidates at this stage of our deliberation.

PERU: [Speaking non-English word or phrase] I will speak in Spanish. Instead of asking for X number of years of experience, perhaps we might say that the candidate should manage in his or her experience for that position and the final decision would be made on the basis of comparison with other candidates, with other years of experience. But I don't think there's a need to give an exact number of years of experience or something like that. Mention that he or she should have experience.

OLGA CAVALLI: What I was saying is that the GAC -- there's no GAC representative right now at the NomCom. So the idea of this guidelines, criteria is that they should bear that in mind when selecting the candidates. We are not in front of the candidate. We cannot say whether they have a relevant experience, a relevant resume. So with this criteria we want to reflect some experience. Of course, I'm not in the AC room which is really bad for me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's just a comment.

OLGA CAVALLI: (off microphone). Yes, we have a comment from Christopher Wilkinson and there are examples of senior public servants who subsequently became board members. Yes, it's true. In Spain I remember our colleague Gonzalo from Chile as well. So there were members of governments that have become board members, yes, that has happened. What we want is to send some message to the NomCom to have this criteria in mind.

Any other comments? So are we okay if we refine this text and send it to the GAC for comments about this criteria? Is that a good idea? United States and Denmark.

UNITED STATES:	From the U.S. perspective, we would like to have additional time to consider this as a working group to be able to take this home and provide edits as appropriate. Thank you.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you, United States. I have Denmark and Iran. Finn.
DENMARK:	Thank you. I didn't catch the -- the answer to the question, is this criteria ranked or are they on equal level, so to speak?
OLGA CAVALLI:	I didn't answer your question, so you're right. Well, it's a very good question. I think that they are all -- they are in certain order, but it doesn't -- one doesn't have a -- a prevalence over the other one. That's my -- but it's a working group work. So it's not what I say, it's just my understanding of it. So I would say that all have the same weight in considering them. Iran.
IRAN:	Thank you, Madam. For years we didn't participate I think from the -- all the priority we have other important issue to deal with that. We are engaged up to July and I prefer that we postpone sending this to the GAC for further discussions for two reasons. One, the one given by United States, more time to see what

other colleagues doing. Second, we will little bit released from the CCWG activity that's now on the peak. We have important issues like human rights, issues around jurisdiction, issues around accountability and so on and so for. And we have -- I have not read your document, that is quite simple, because I cannot have more than 24 hours in a day, 24 hours maximum. So that's all. I cannot -- (indiscernible) hours at that. So we are fully busy and there are so many things. GAC should decide what would be the engagement of the GAC in sending the person to the community. Now we have decided to send the chair of the GAC for three months. We have -- renewed that, another three months. There are so many issues. Let us put it on silence, we discuss with the other group, get experience, thank you very much. If you have more information like the RFC, add to that one, but we don't send it to the GAC at this stage. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kavouss. Your comment is very relevant, but let me share my view as representative of Argentina. I think that the role of the NomCom is extremely important in the structure of ICANN. They select half of the Board, which is very important. They select members of the ALAC, they select members of the ccNSO, and they select members of the GNSO. So having no participation and no involvement from government in such an important group that has such an important role, from the

Argentina government, it's an imbalance of our role within the ICANN community. And this is not related with what we want to achieve in a multistakeholder processes and model that we all are engaged with.

So this is my comment, not as chair of the working group. It's a comment as representative of the government of Argentina.

This is why we started this working group, and some of the colleagues have agreed that this is an important issue, at least to be considered at the GAC level.

So do we have other comments?

Let me check if I have something else to show you.

These are the criteria. So let me -- let me propose to you the following. I will rephrase the text. I will share it with the working group. I would welcome the information about the RFCs that our colleague from Senegal told us about some minutes ago. And it could be good if we set up a deadline, perhaps in the near future before Denmark, and decide if we are able to share with the -- with the GAC.

I wonder -- I want to do this in silent. I think it's a very important issue. I don't know if others have any comments about that, but just ignoring that this important role of the NomCom and the nonparticipation of governments in it, I think it's something that

is an important thing to consider. Perhaps not in the immediate time, because we are very busy, but in the long and medium term, it's something to have in mind.

So my proposal is that. Refine the text. Send it to you with a specific deadline to the working group for comments. If we can include the information from the RFC from our colleague -- proposed by our colleague from Senegal, and any other comments for the near future.

So perhaps before -- before Denmark, we could have some text.

It's a very short text. I mean, it shouldn't take a long time. It's half a page of this criteria. It shouldn't take a long time for you to review it and consult and make comments.

So perhaps after this meeting, in one month or one month and a half, we could have some comments from our colleagues and have a new text for. And then we can decide what to do.

Any comments to my proposal of next steps?

Manal.

EGYPT: Thank you, Olga. Actually, I agree to your proposal.

I was just looking at the exchanges on the working group mailing list, and I think there is one aspect that was not -- we did not

conclude on the mailing list. There was one criteria mentioned by the ALAC, which is interest and knowledge of Internet governance issues. And we were discussing on the mailing list whether -- whether this is one criteria to be added or not. And we did not conclude. We said let's hear what others would say, but we never concluded on this.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Manal. So you're proposing adding this to our criteria?

EGYPT: I was just wondering whether this is something that we should consider. It's an ALAC criteria.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, you're right.

So in the next draft that I will end, I will include it and see if we can gather some comments from the group. And we are lucky to have Olof here. He's a very experienced participant of the NomCom. So he did some comments in previous meetings about what is the level of -- confident- -- con- -- ooh, that's a very complicated word for me. Confidentiality. Especially with jet

lag. How it works in the NomCom. Maybe you can share, because there was a question from Colombia about that.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. This is Olof Nordling for the record, and in a previous life I was supporting the Nominating Committee.

So drawing on that experience, well, the matter of confidentiality, I mean it was considered by some that, well, this is cabalistic, there's secrecy and everything. But, actually, there is just one part that is really confidential, and that is the identity of the candidates. And it is for good reason.

In order to get the best possible candidates that may find it a bit embarrassing, first of all, if they apply and are not selected, and if they, well, would be reluctant to actually apply if everything was in the open. That's sort of the main rationales for this, the confidentiality that's there.

But everything else, when it comes to the process, how they're operating, they go to quite some length in explaining in monthly newsletters to -- on a scorecard, you could say, that, okay, what have we been up to now. And they also have presentations at the ICANN meetings about what the processes is and what the --

EN

how they advance from -- in the various stages in their selection process.

So it's actually about the candidates and their identity. Until, of course, the final selection has been made.

And also, they take into account, and that's worth to be noted as well, that they take into account, they actually go to the Board, to the GNSO and elsewhere in order to get input on the profile that they should be looking for, because that may change from one year to the next, depending on who are the outgoing members in the particular SOs and ACs and the Board that they are selecting to.

So, well, I guess as a little brief glimpse on what is meant by confidentiality in the NomCom -- in the NomCom circumstances, I think maybe that can be useful as comment.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: And thanks to you, Olof. Were you there when there was a GAC observer active participating in the past? Do you recall that experience or....

OLOF NORDLING: That was actually even before my time, and I started in 2005.

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

I think there was -- maybe 2005 was the last NomCom year when there was a GAC participant, and for various reasons. There has always been one seat at the NomCom reserved from a participant appointed by the GAC, but since has not been utilized.

So -- Well, it has happened, but it's in past history nowadays.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Olof.

Any other comments? We have to close the session because it's -- Yes, Manal, please.

EGYPT: Just a quick question, if Olof knows. Because Olga has already shared with us the personal qualities and experience identified by ICANN Board advice to NomCom in October 2014. And it mainly says what skills are needed on the Board, I think for that time period. So I was wondering whether there is something more recent than 2014 that was conveyed by the Board to the NomCom?

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you for the question. I wouldn't know that off the cuff, but I know it's a common practice by the NomCom to solicit

input. And not only from the Board but from the SOs and ACs as well. For criteria that they would like to see in the selection, in the candidates that the NomCom selects.

So not a definite answer, but I would find it very, very likely that there has been an update, or perhaps a reconfirmation from the Board on that document.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Olof. We may check with the new Board chair. He is experienced in the NomCom as well. Not only as chair; as participant.

Okay. Any other comments? Seeing none, thank you very much for your attention.

So the thing is the following. I will send the updated text based on our comments today. And we will try to find the agreed text to share with the GAC in the near future.

And for those of you interested in being in the working group list, just let Julia or Gulten know and they will include you. And thank you very much for your attention, and good meeting for all of us.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]