JOHANNESBURG – GAC's Participation in the NomCom Working Group
Thursday, June 29, 2017 – 08:30 to 09:15 JNB
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. Stop joking. Let's start with the meeting because we have only 45 minutes. Thank you for being with me this morning. I was just trying to wake all of us up a little bit. And the session about today -- of today is about the working group that reviews the participation of the GAC in the NomCom. I have prepared a very brief PowerPoint with a very, very short background about what is the NomCom and which is the role of the GAC in the NomCom so far.

Review the document that the working group draft, that the working group has prepared. As you can recall in the meeting we had in Denmark, we agreed to review the text. We were okay with the concept in general, but we wanted to review the text because we -- we thought that the -- the wording was not totally fine.

We have a new text for you to -- to review. And then the idea would be once we are okay with this text, which is quite short and I circulated in the GAC list to you, we could share it with the whole GAC to see if we are in agreement and eventually send it to the NomCom. Just for you to know, criteria for the NomCom

EN

has been submitted by the Board. Criteria was submitted by the ALAC and by the ccNSO. It's references of how the candidate selected should be considered in relation with the interest of the different supporting organizations or advisory committees.

So can we go to the next one, Gulten, please.

Oh, we missed how to say good morning in Turkish.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone)

OLGA CAVALLI: I couldn't hear but --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Gunaydin.

OLGA CAVALLI: Gunaydin. Thank you so much.

Okay. What is the NomCom? It's a group of appointed persons by the different SOs and ACs that they have a very important responsibility. They select members among a group of candidates for important leadership roles in -- in ICANN. They select half of the Board, not all at the same time. They rotate in

years, but they are responsible for the selection of half of the Board, which is eight members.

They select three members of the GNSO, three members of the ccNSO, and three members of the ALAC.

Of course GAC has members appointed by the governments, so we don't get into this category of they select members for us, but they do select members for the Board, for the GNSO, and the ccNSO, and the ALAC.

As I said, these members are not appointed all at the same time every three or four or two years, but they are rotating in -- in the time.

Can we go to the next one? If you have any doubt, please let me know because we are few and I can see you very well from here.

So the composition of the NomCom. Who are the members of this group that select this important part of the leadership of ICANN? There are 15 voting members and three nonvoting members. Seven members appointed by the GNSO, five members appointed by the ALAC, one member appointed by the ccNSO, one by the ASO, and one by the IETF, the IAB.

Good morning. We're having -- learning how to say good morning in several languages, but English is fine. Muy bien. Buenos dias. Gracias.

And there are three nonvoting members. One seat for the GAC, which is not -- nobody is appointed at the moment, one for the SSAC, and one for the RS- -- I cannot pronounce that. RSSAC.

There is one nonvoting chair, one nonvoting chair elect, and one nonvoting associate chair. This is the composition of the NomCom. Thank you.

So, can we go to the previous one, Gulten, please? Thank you so much.

So the idea is review why the GAC is not appointing someone to the nonvoting seat, but for the moment we have agreed in preparing some criteria that could be submitted to the NomCom to have in mind when selecting those persons that will be in these leadership positions.

As I said, there are criteria from the Board, from the ALAC, and from the ccNSO, so GAC could be also the advisory committee providing some guidance to the NomCom when making the selection.

Now, yes, please go to the next one.

Next, please. Yes. Thank you so much.

So this text is -- has been reviewed several times by the working group, would be, if accepted by the working group first and then

by the NomCom -- by the GAC, submitted to the NomCom as possible criteria for GAC to be used in the NomCom. So I will read the text.

Just for your reference, we were kind of okay in the working group with the text, but we found that the -- that it could be enhanced. So this is a new text, different from what we reviewed in the last meeting. I got contributions from some members of the working group. Not many, but some. I think it was Manal, myself, and I think someone else.

So the concept is the same, but the language has changed a little bit. Hopefully for the better. So I will read it: The GAC is of the view that the ICANN Board should include, in grate, members who have the following qualities and attributes. The personal qualities and experience identified by the ICANN Board in its advice to the NomCom of March 2017.

This is quite new, and the reference to this text is in the link below. So you can check, if you want, in your computers.

The rationale for this is: It is a matter of good public policy that ICANN operate efficiently and effectively. The criteria identified by the Board appear to be a reasonable set of operational requirements for this purpose.

So we somehow are saying we are okay with the criteria identified by the Board in March of this year.

Any comments to this first -- to this first quality? There are only four. There is this slide and the next one.

Are we okay? Yeah, I cannot see you very well from here. Ashley, sorry. Yes, please, go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, good morning. And this isn't a comment. It's just perhaps since it's so early and it's our last day, would it be possible just to indicate generally what the new aspects that have been introduced since our last discussion? It doesn't have to be precisely but just generally. That would help tremendously.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Ashley, this is a good comment. It is exactly the same text. We just improve the -- and of course you will be much useful because English is your mother tongue, not mine. We just improve the -- (non-English word or phrase). How do I say that? Help me, Jorge. The wording. Thank you very much. It's very early.

Only that. The concepts are exactly the same.

Would it be okay if I find the old text?

Ashley, would that help? I cannot see.

UNITED STATES: It might generally be helpful. I think I'm perfectly fine with this particular criteria, but if others find it useful to have the old text side by side.

OLGA CAVALLI: I suggest to follow. Let's read this version, and in the meantime I can check the other one.

We agreed in the previous text, but in the last meeting we -- we thought that the wording could be enhanced. But the concepts are exactly the same.

So any other comments about the first one, the personal qualities and experience identified by the ICANN Board in its advice to the NomCom of March 2017? And you can check the link in your computers.

Okay. I see none. Go to the next one.

A record of achievement in the public sector including with national or local government, public authorities, or enter governmental bodies.

The rationale for this is experience in working or interacting with governments. This could occur at different roles, given the significant responsibilities of regional and local government in some countries.

The link below relates with the first one, with the ICANN Board rationale.

And I have Egypt and Indonesia. Yes, Manal.

EGYPT: Thank you, Olga.

I just feel that the drafting of the rationale seems more of an explanation of the criteria than a rationale. So maybe if we say "this provides experience" or "ensures exper-" -- I mean, we need to put a reason here rather than just explain what the criteria is, if you see what I mean.

OLGA CAVALLI: Of course. I see what you mean. Let me find my version. I will make changes in it.

Do you have a specific suggestion?

EN

EGYPT: I'm trying.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. We have half an hour. But it's short. It's another --
                                another slide and that's it. It's very short text.

EGYPT: Maybe, but of course -- maybe we can say this ensures
                                experience in working or interacting with governments? Is this a
                                good rationale?

OLGA CAVALLI: And this is at the beginning of the rationale?

EGYPT: Yeah. I'm just trying to think out loud, but if native speakers
                                have a better formulation.

OLGA CAVALLI: So the point -- the point of Manal is relevant. The rationale
                                should be rewarded.

                                 Any suggestions that?

Olof, of course. What are we going to do without you, Olof? I'm nervous about it.

OLOF NORDLING: You could put at the end -- thank you, Chair. You could put at the end of the first sentence, "Would ensure."

"Experience in working or interacting with governments would ensure a good understanding by the Board of GAC input," for example.

OLGA CAVALLI: "Would ensure?"

OLOF NORDLING: "A good understanding by the Board of GAC or governmental input."

OLGA CAVALLI: So the rationale would be experience in working or interacting with governments would ensure a good understanding?

OLOF NORDLING: By the Board.

EN

OLGA CAVALLI: By the Board? But they appoint -- they appoint --

OLOF NORDLING: Of input from governments.

OLGA CAVALLI: Of input from governments. I will read it again.

                        So the rationale would say: Experience in working or interacting with governments would ensure a good understanding of inputs from governments.

OLOF NORDLING: Good understanding by the Board. I think that's useful.

OLGA CAVALLI: Good understanding by the Board.

                        Okay. Of input from governments.

                        Yes, sorry, I was looking at my computer. I had Indonesia and UK.

                        Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Olga, not related directly to the wording, but I just wonder when you are discussing this in the group about rationale, you are also discussing about -- what call it? Worst case that may happen. Because if the government -- the government advice is not taken into account in the -- in the Board, for example, then it may happen that lots government or group of government can then set up their own Internet, and at the end of the day, we don't -- I'm afraid we do not have the so-called our vision, one world, one Internet. We can end up with one world, many Internets.

So this will give the rationale as why. In the Board, we will have to have people who really understand the way the government works, not only in the advanced countries, in western countries, in the eastern part, in the African countries, you know. Because the government in many island, government in many area of the world also thinks differently, you see, depending on the country itself.

So I think that when we are talking about actually working with (indiscernible) governments, it has to be somehow shown that the experience is also in many -- in many area of the -- of the countries -- in many area of the world, not only in one country only.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you, Indonesia.
	Do you have a proposed change to the text?
INDONESIA:	The idea of this -- of this -- of this criteria is for this group, the NomCom. They are not composed by government people. And if we would one day occupy the nonvoting seat, we would have no vote. They have in mind that having experience in the government would be useful. Yes.
INDONESIA:	Ensure continuation. At the moment, the (indiscernible) are in the Board. We have people from Singapore. We have people from Malaysia, if I'm not mistaken. So we have to make sure also that they also have the experience of working with their own government. Malaysian government, Singapore government, and so on.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Thanks to you.
	I have United Kingdom and Iran. And Manal, you wanted to take the floor? Okay.
	Please, Mark.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Olga. Good morning, everybody.

I just wondered if here is the place to reference public interest, understand of public interest perspectives. Is that later on?

OLGA CAVALLI: In the next one.

UNITED KINGDOM: Maybe I'm jumping, then.

OLGA CAVALLI: (Off microphone).

UNITED KINGDOM: Yeah.   Just going back to the main quality or record of achievement in the public sector, is that already agreed text? Is it?

OLGA CAVALLI: No. We are working on text. It's not agreed.

UNITED KINGDOM: It sounds like a very high bar, a record of achievement.

OLGA CAVALLI: Please, suggest better English. It's my second language.

UNITED KINGDOM: Well, perhaps it's experience of the public sector through engaging or interacting with governments.

A record of achievement sounds like, you know, a career path of high-level positions and responsibility. Is that really what we're aiming for?

OLGA CAVALLI: No, not necessarily.

UNITED KINGDOM: Because that's really quite a high bar.

Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Not necessarily. This is exactly what we need, a better wording. Can you repeat what you said so I can write it here?

UNITED KINGDOM: Experience of working with the public sector.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Instead of saying "a record of achievement."

UNITED KINGDOM: In the -- Yeah, instead of "a record of achievement in," experience of working --

OLGA CAVALLI: Experience working in --

UNITED KINGDOM: -- with or in the public sector, you could say.

OLGA CAVALLI: This is a suggestion by Mark.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yeah.

OLGA CAVALLI: I think it's okay.

                       Ashley.

UNITED STATES:	Yes. I agree with the UK's recommendation as long as it contains "with or in." Because if it's just "experience in," that would prove problematic because that would be very limiting. Thank you.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Let me, before giving the floor to Iran, I wrote here "experience of working in the public sector," comma. Is that okay?
UNITED KINGDOM:	"In or with."
OLGA CAVALLI:	"In or with." Okay. In or with the public sector. Is that okay? Yes?
UNITED KINGDOM:	Yeah. If we say "with," that covers situations where somebody might be an advisor or have had some consultative role or something like that, yes, rather than actually a member of the civil service or --
OLGA CAVALLI:	Okay. Ashley, is that okay? So I have here experience of working in or with the public sector; right? Okay.

UNITED KINGDOM: With or in, yeah.

OLGA CAVALLI: Or in. "With or in." Moment. With or in the public sector.

Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Madam.

The reason that I have not intervened is that no matter what word you put, I don't have the assurance that it will be implemented.

My experience in other organization is that many thing is put in the paper, but there are other things which influence totally that. This is this problem.

Now, having said that, in the leading paragraph, I don't real understanding the meaning. "The GAC is of the view that the ICANN Board should include, in aggregate." Are you talking of collectively? Collegially? I don't understand how we have collegial qualifications. That they have this one, and the other have that one, and the other have that one? What collegially now? Should not every board member have these qualifications? Or just one in generally and collegially they have

that. So one of them have this experience, the other have that experience. So I don't think that. Generally, each board member should have this sort of qualifications. So --

OLGA CAVALLI: So your suggestion --

IRAN: -- Manal is very emotional to comment on what I have said.

OLGA CAVALLI: -- is keep -- keep the comment.

IRAN: Yeah. Thank you.

I don't think "quality" is a correct word. "Qualification" but not "quality."

OLGA CAVALLI: So before giving the floor to Manal, you want to delete "in aggregate" or change it.

IRAN: So far I don't understand the meaning. If Manal wants to explain, what do we mean by aggregate. First of all, aggregate is

EN

not correct word for this sort of activities. Individually, collectively, but not aggregate. Aggregate is for some other technical things. Single entry, aggregate entry, so it's not administrative term. So collectively should have, individually should have. Thank you. Quality is not correct, in my view. Following qualifications. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: So your concerns are with "in aggregate" and with "qualities."

IRAN: Qualities. I suggest qualifications.

OLGA CAVALLI: Manal, go ahead. Thank you.

EGYPT: Thank you, Olga. Thank you, Kavouss. Just my understanding is that we mean the same thing, which is collectively, as you rightly mentioned. So it's not individually, it's collectively. So maybe if aggregate, if you want to change aggregate, we can find another word or put collectively. And again, we have native speakers who can help. But just to highlight that this is a collective thing and not each and every member should have all those criteria for them. Thank you.

EN

OLGA CAVALLI: One second. I'm taking notes of what -- what -- thank you, Manal. Other comments? United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. I think the intention here, collectively is one option, I guess. Amongst its membership. Amongst the membership of the board.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay.

UNITED KINGDOM: Because there is a -- an expectation and a requirement that there be a diversity of skills and experience amongst the board's membership. You know, some -- as we heard earlier in the week, the importance of some having legal skills, others having experience, as we are saying here, of the public interest and working with or actually in a public capacity. So amongst its membership is another option maybe. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Ashley, yes.

UNITED STATES: Yes, Mark pretty much said exactly what I was going to say. But just to be clear, and not to be emotional about it, I just wanted to indicated that aggregate and collectively generally means the same thing. If collectively is -- resonates better with people, perfectly fine with the use of that word. As long as we maintain that concept. Because as Mark said, I mean, the board needs to be diverse in nature to a certain degree. It's important that there be a representative on the board that has experience working with or in government, but it should not have to be a requirement for every single board member. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. I will read the suggested changes. In the first paragraph "The GAC is of the view that the ICANN board should include" -- sorry, "collectively" or another option suggested by Mark, "amongst its membership members who have the following qualifications and attributes." Does it sound better? Okay, after the session I will circulate this red line text so you can check it. Can -- we have 15 minutes. I would like us to have the chance to review the next slide with the rest of the text and maybe then we can -- we can create a new red line version and share it with the group or with those that are interested. Manal.

EGYPT: Thank you. I had a problem understanding the first criteria on the slide, and now checking the old text, the old version, the text is different. And I wonder why did we change it and what do we mean by the new drafting? Would you like me read it?

OLGA CAVALLI: Please, go ahead.

EGYPT: So the old version says, "An understanding and appreciation of advancing the public interest through building partnerships and consensus."

OLGA CAVALLI: Sorry, Manal, that's the next slide. Can you hold on a second, please? Oh, because I was looking at my computer. I'm so sorry. So can we move to the next slide? I'm not -- yeah, I know. But I was just asking if there are no more comments about the first one. So we are on the second one. Apologies. I'm looking at my computer and taking notes. So Manal, you have the other text, the previous one? We're talking about this -- let me read it, what is in the screen. "An understanding of how to conceal the public interest and other interests, like the private sector or other stakeholder's ones, with experience in building partnerships and consensus." The rationale for this is "Experience with public-

private partnerships and/or multistakeholder processes with track record on developing a consultative approach and a focus on what is both possible and workable." And Manal, can you refer to us the previous text?

EGYPT: So the previous text reads, "An understanding and appreciation of advancing the public interest through building partnerships and consensus." And I'm not sure what we mean here by "conceal the public interest." So if -- I understand more the old text than I -- I'm in favor of the old text, but I leave it here. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: It's a collective effort. We receive comments and we keep on changing it. Can you read it again, so we can compare it with -- thank you so much.

EGYPT: "An understanding and appreciation of advancing the public interest through building partnerships and consensus."

UNITED KINGDOM: U.K. speaking. Yes, I agree with Manal's proposal. I don't know how the idea of concealing comes -- has emerged. I mean, that's

hiding public interest, which I don't think anybody wants us to do. So I would support the proposal from Manal. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Any other comments about the old text?

OLOF NORDLING: It's Olof here.

OLGA CAVALLI: Sorry, Olof, I don't see you. Of course.

OLOF NORDLING: Frankly conceal, it must have been a mistake but somebody because reconcile the public interest may have been the intention.

OLGA CAVALLI: If -- if -- I don't see any opposition. I go to the previous text, and if someone sends the new text, should be okay with that. Okay. Fantastic. What about the rationale, are we okay with it? Manal.

EGYPT: So again, I feel the rationale here is again more of an explanation of the criteria, but it doesn't really provide the

rationale. So like within the previous criteria, maybe we can tweak the drafting a little bit to provide the reason why this is an important criteria. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Like having experience with public partnerships and other stakeholders -- like -- any suggestions? Yes. South Africa.

SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, chairperson, and good morning.   I think the rationale could be that of conflict resolution because basically if you are reconciling the different ideas, so the rationale would be that of appointing someone who would be capable of maneuvering, you know, a conflict situation and is able to negotiate in a (indiscernible) manner.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. So adding conflict resolution as one of the desired experiences, is that okay with the rest of the group? I think it's a good -- it's a very good suggestion. About the wording. Of the rationale.   Let's think about it and go to the last one.   "An understanding of the value of diversity for a global organization like ICANN." And the rationale for that is, "The ICANN bylaws include references to geographic and cultural diversity as criteria for board composition. Gender and linguistic diversity

are legitimate public policy goals, especially when applied to a global organization that strives to be inclusive. Hence all aspects of diversity should be considered." Yes, go ahead. I cannot recall your name.

GUYANA: Lance Hinds.

OLGA CAVALLI: Oh, Lance, yes.

GUYANA: Seems to be too much, Chair. It could pretty much stop at "inclusive." If you go on to "Hence all aspects of diversity" it seems like you're repeating yourself.

OLGA CAVALLI: You suggest "ICANN bylaws include" (indiscernible). So the last sentence, you propose to delete it.

GUYANA: I don't think it's necessary. I think you've made the point before.

OLGA CAVALLI: So I'll mark it as deleted. Any other -- are we okay with that? So that would be only, "The ICANN bylaws include references to geographic and cultural diversity as criteria for both composition. Gender and linguistic diversity are legitimate public policy goals, especially when applied to a global organization that strives to be inclusive." Period. How about the sentence, "An understanding of the value of diversity for a global organization like ICANN." Any comments about that?

UNITED KINGDOM: U.K. speaking. Yeah, it's a critical element that ICANN demonstrates and puts in place, a fully diverse -- fully diverse representation across all its operations, including at the board level. So perhaps add, of the value and importance of diversity for a global organization -- for ICANN as the global coordinator for the Domain Name System. An understanding of the value and importance of diversity for ICANN as the global coordinator of the Domain Name System. Stop.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. I took notes so I read it again. "An understanding of the value and importance of diversity for ICANN as a global coordinator of the domain name system. Reactions? Comments? Iran.

IRAN: This is a criteria for the NomCom board?   Do I have that understanding?

OLGA CAVALLI: For the NomCom when selecting members of the board.

IRAN: So the NomCom Committee should have this -- this is a qualification of NomCom but not the board?

OLGA CAVALLI: It's criteria sent from the GAC to the NomCom.

IRAN: Yeah.

OLGA CAVALLI: For them to have in mind when selecting members of the board.

IRAN: So that selection should be based off a board member should have the understanding of diversity?   Everyone has understanding of diversity.   I don't know.   There is an incoherence between the rationale and the title. The rationale,

yes.   The ICANN bylaw includes reference to geographic and cultural diversity as criteria for board composition, yes, it's good. Gender and linguistic diversity, all that.

But this has nothing to do with the title, an understanding of that. Maybe you should reverse the situation.

OLGA CAVALLI: Do you have a proposed text?

IRAN: I said that idea already. Understand -- I don't know what you want to say this.

OLGA CAVALLI: I'm not saying it. It's the text that has been built among all of us. Sometimes you have to -- we have to review it again.

I'm not the one saying this. Please don't -- I don't have that power.

IRAN: No. When I say "you," means not yourself, means we say yeah. I don't understand this text. I don't understand. This is the qualifications of a board that will be elected -- selected by the

NomCom, that that board should have understanding of value of diversity and a global organization.

OLGA CAVALLI: I think that the concept that we wanted to include in this sentence is that, that member of the board or the leadership position should have in mind the value of diversity for global organization like ICANN, not all the organizations are globally -- have a global responsibility like ICANN.   Some others are regional.   Some others are national.   And board members are -- have a different role, and the perspective of the members are different.   So I think that's the idea of this sentence.   But, of course, we can enhance it.

Ashley?

UNITED STATES: Thank you.   I look forward to seeing the red lines, but I just wanted to state my support for this concept.   I think it is very important.   I think it's been proven to be of importance to many GAC members when it comes to geographic diversity.   I think also from the perspective of gender and linguistic diversity, it's very important.   I think it has been proven in this forum and others that that is not always the case.   So I think it's very important that we maintain this language.   Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Let me ask you if you think the wording is okay?

UNITED STATES: Again, I look forward to seeing the red lines. I'm currently fine with -- as it stands. But I believe I'm supportive with the edits that are made by the U.K. But I look forward to seeing the red-line changes.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Iran.

IRAN: No, I don't understand this at all. It has no meaning. An understanding of value of diversity, what does it mean? We are talking of the member to be selected has that understanding? If NomCom wants to select X, they should have the understanding of value of diversity? How they can check that? They go through a special test? How can they vet that? I don't understand that somebody say I know. They are always talking of this diversity. I have no problem. They come to the plenipotentiary talking about diversity, so on and so forth. They put the criteria for the consultation having the gender, I have no problem at all. But

this has no meaning, this title. I don't agree with that. I'm sorry, I don't agree with that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Manal.

EGYPT: So let me try to help provide some clarity here. I think what's meant here is that they value the concept of diversity and they respect it and they try to work on fulfilling it. Like, for example, they try to support having interpretation in ICANN meetings. They do value that people are different, of different cultures, speak different languages. They have to, I mean, treat them equally, listen to them, give them the chance to express themselves if they are not that fluent, respect their different cultures.

So this is the essence of the criteria, I think, so... Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: I will read it again. One second, please, Iran.

An understanding of the value and importance of diversity for ICANN as a global coordinator of the Domain Name System. We're talking about this new text.

Please, Iran, go ahead.

EN

IRAN: Thank you, madam. I have no problem with the concept of diversity, linguistic, gender, so on and so forth. But I'm talking of implementation.   We are saying that the NomCom, when selecting a board member, that board member should have understanding of diversity. How they can do that?

Suppose that I'm a candidate for the board, put my name to the NomCom.   NomCom should verify whether I have this understanding?   How they do that?   I put in my curricular activities. I'm fully in favor of all of this. What does it mean to have understanding?   I'm talking of implications and implementations, not the substance.   The substance, I fully agree with all types of diversity, even though in GAC we don't have agreement with each other.   Remember that from the diversity view, we say that there is no consensus in GAC. And now we have conflict. I have no problem.

But this as a title, I don't understand that. Not the concept, I agree -- I don't know how NomCom should identify and verify and vetting that candidate have this understanding. There is a particular test? Put some injections and reactions? Yes, I have this understand -- I don't understand this.

EN

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Iran. Before giving the floor to Manal and to Thiago, do you propose to delete it? Is that your proposal?

IRAN: I am not proposing to delete it. I don't know what we want to say. In fact, some part of the rationale would be better suited for the title.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Before going -- Olof, we have -- we are running out of time.

OLOF NORDLING: We are due to close right now actually.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay.

OLOF NORDLING: Next session is supposed to be implementation of new bylaws.

OLGA CAVALLI: It's here?

ICANN 59
POLICY FORUM
JOHANNESBURG
26–29 June 2017

OLOF NORDLING:	Well, yes, it's right here. But, on the other hand, I don't see our GAC chair anywhere. So I guess you can continue.
OLGA CAVALLI:	In the meantime, we can keep on talking. So we have some more minutes. Before giving the floor to Manal and Thiago, I would suggest the following. And United Kingdom, sorry. I don't see very well from this eye.
	So let's take some more comments, and perhaps I can produce a red-line document and share it with the group. Manal.
EGYPT:	So just to make sure I understand correctly, you're fine with the criteria but you want to change the rationale? But you're okay -- Iran, please.
IRAN:	I'm in favor of the rationale, but I'm not happy with the title because it is unimplementable. People applying for that post, there is no way to verify whether or not they have that understanding. Can you tell me how they could do that? By just declaration that I have full understanding of diversity. So that's all.

EN

EGYPT: It applies for other criteria as well. I mean, the previous criteria is an understanding of how to advance public interest, how are we going to measure this.

IRAN: That is the problem. All of this understanding, I don't know where this understanding comes from. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thiago. This is the last comment, and then we wrap up.

BRAZIL: If I understand correctly, the concerns raised by the representative of Iran, perhaps they could be addressed if we -- instead of referring to understanding as a criteria, we turn that criteria into objective criteria. For example, that the person has had some experience in the multicultural setting. So I think this could perhaps be acceptable to Iran if we -- instead of referring to subjective criteria, we included some objective reference as a proven record in some sort of multicultural, diverse working setting.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Brazil. I took note. United Kingdom and we have to wrap up.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you. I agree with what Brazil has said. Maybe this is addressing Iran's concern.

What we are setting out here are criteria that a GAC participant in NomCom will wash -- will wish to advance and scrutinize in considering candidates for the board. So a person must demonstrate that they would adhere to the principles of diversity and also public interest aspects.

So these are not headings, are they? They're criteria which would be tested and a GAC participant would -- this is a brief, if you would like, for the GAC participant in NomCom. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, U.K. Not only for the GAC participant but also if we don't participate for all the rest to have in mind that these are valuable criteria for the GAC when selecting the members of the board and the other leadership positions.

UNITED KINGDOM: Sorry, I'm just following on from the heading in the red box, "Scenarios for GAC participation."

OLGA CAVALLI: We should change that. Okay. Thank you very much. I will circulate a red-lined version with your comments that I captured, and I will check the transcribing. Thank you very much.

And if you are interested in this issue, please subscribe to the list of the working group. And do your comments when I send the next text. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]