

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Thursday, 21 September 2017 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-ssc-21sep17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p5j7nqnl2xg/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/Yy8hB>

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

Coordinator: Your recording has started. You may now proceed.

Julie Bisland: Okay thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee on the 21st of September, 2017. On the call today we have Susan Kawaguchi, Rafik Dammak, Tony Holmes, Maxim Alzoba, Frederic Guillemaut. Apologies from Renata Aquino Ribeiro and Lori Schulman:

From staff we have Emily Barabas, Marika Konings, Andrea Glandon and myself, Julie Bisland.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. Thank you. With this I'll turn it back over Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you so much and welcome, Tony. Tony is stepping in for Osvaldo to help us make this decision on the GAC liaison. And I was wondering – and also Carlos is – Gutiérrez is but he hasn't shown up yet but hopefully he'll catch up with us today.

And I was – is there any SOI updates today? So seeing no hands, I guess no one has anything to change or report. It looks like Tony is typing. So we have the GAC liaison to decide. And I should back up – yesterday we had a Council meeting and the – some of you may have been listening into that but just in case you weren't, the GNSO Council accepted and approved our three choices of candidates for the ATRT 3. They were – seemed very happy. And I did express the concern we have with more candidates and especially more geo and gender diversity candidates so that we have more to pick from in – when we're doing our selection process.

So we got that done. We've done quite a bit of work this year, which I think I'm surprised at that. Not that this group couldn't do it but I just didn't realize moving forward how many different selections we would be asked to make. And, Maxim, I'm hoping Carlos will. I know that he – that Julf had asked him to join so hopefully.

So now we have the GAC liaison and the application period closed. We have three applications and hopefully you've all looked at these. They've been endorsed by different parts of the community. And personally I just happen to know that Julf was endorsed by the BC, the Registry Stakeholder Group and the NCSG. So – or NCUC, I'm not sure which one.

But thanks, Marika, so we're not quite done with all our work. We have our charter after this – I see you put that in the notes. So that wasn't indicated on his application on the wiki so I just wanted to note that on Julf. I don't know if that's true of other candidates, but Marika or Emily, do you know if there was more than one endorsement for each of these candidates? I think that would be handy to know.

Emily Barabas: Hi, Susan. This is Emily. I can answer that for you.

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm sorry I was looking at our wiki instead of the Adobe. Go ahead, Emily.

Emily Barabas: No problem. So we got, as you said, three candidates. They are Julf, Osvaldo and – hang on, let me just pull up the wiki – and Paul Rosenzweig. And Julf and Paul were submitted through the NCSG or by the NCSG on their behalf and Osvaldo was submitted by the ISPCP.

Susan Kawaguchi: So that's sort of interesting because do we only accept one endorsement because I know that the BC also submitted his application and endorsed him.

Emily Barabas: Interesting. I can check with the SO/AC support team who received the application and just confirm so you were w saying that was Julf that was also from the BC or...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, yes from the BC.

Emily Barabas: Okay, let me double check with them about that because I did see an email from the NCSG but I need to double check on the BC one.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, it's just – I'm just curious more from process. I mean, I think, you know, we all know Julf and – but I just happen to know that the BC had made the decision to do so and Marika was asking if I know where it was sent. I'll find that out, I'm not sure that's critical for our selection today but it would be good to know if more than one community or stakeholder constituency endorses someone that that's recorded.

And, Maxim, you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record, just a small update. Actually, at the moment the Registrars supported Julf too and Registries are thinking about it but I will have – I hope to have confirmation during the next week from RySG just formal. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay so I had the wrong – right, I thought it was the Registrars and so, I mean, I thought it was the Registries but it was the Registrars. Okay. Thanks for that. And Marika, I couldn't tell you if, you know, oh Maxim would know on the Registrars, okay. And, Marika, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So just to note indeed that the endorsement is only to kind of pass the first hurdle to be able to be considered. So of course it's good to have, you know, more groups endorse a candidate that may of course give an indication of the support candidates are evaluated. But for, you know, this initial step we basically only need, you know, one stakeholder group or constituency to indicate endorsement for the application to be valid.

And as I noted in my chat as well, we did receive individual applications, we all kind of redirected to stakeholder groups and constituencies for endorsement, but as far as we know those did not receive endorsements and as such they're not considered valid applications. You know, as Emily noted, we will check in and see, you know, other endorsements, you know, got misplaced because I think we do want to at least put on the record, you know, which candidates were endorsed by which groups so we'll definitely look into that.

And of course if you have any information of where those emails were sent I think the GNSO secretariat's email was the one that was used for the general submissions. So at least we can track and see as well if for next time, you know, we need to maybe have a dedicated mailbox to make sure that nothing gets lost or really make clear where this needs to get sent.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that sounds good. And so on the other applications that didn't have an endorsement, did you send those to all the stakeholder groups or just the one that was most likely to endorse?

Marika Konings: No, we basically wrote to the people that applied and told them that, you know, they needed to reach out to whatever stakeholder group they felt, you

know, they were most aligned with and look for endorsements. And I think in one case as well a person actually copied in I think the Executive Committee of one of the groups and we actually went back to ask, "Well, does this mean you're endorsing this person?" And they didn't confirm that that was the case so we indicated there as well it's not just sufficient putting someone on copy, we basically – your candidacy needs to be submitted by a stakeholder group or constituency in order to be considered a valid application.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes. That makes sense. Okay. Well it's good to know. And how many – you said there were several – can you tell me the number of those that were submitted without endorsements?

Marika Konings: I want to say two. And Emily can correct me if I have that wrong.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so it's not – I mean, I would be more concerned if we had 10 or something.

Marika Konings: No. No, no, no.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, and then you would sort of wonder if we need to change how we, you know, the instructions or something if that many people were confused, so. All right, so we have until October 8 to rank the candidates and then submit by October 16 submit the motion with the candidate's name in it. So does anybody have any thoughts on exactly how we would like to go about selecting the GAC liaison candidates? Marika, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I can give you a little bit of feedback or insight on how this was done for the previous two selections. You know, as you may recall at that point it was the responsibility of the Council leadership to make that selection, so basically the chair and the two vice chairs. And the way they did that – and, Emily, I don't know if you were already pulling up the evaluation documents, but that might be helpful to see. They actually used an evaluation

sheet in which they ranked each of the candidates along the lines of a number of criteria.

Let me see if I can – here we are. So basically looking at the call for applications, looking at the responsibilities of the liaison this is the sheet that they used to kind of evaluate each of the candidates along the lines of you know, a set number of skills and requirements and then scoring on a, you know, 1-10 scale and also, you know, listing kind of, you know, what other factors should be considered either positive or negative.

So the scoring was one indication and then the other factors could then be, you know, part of the conversation especially in those cases where candidates might, you know, rank very close to each other so they would use that to then have an overall average as a kind of indication of where you know, people would score. And that was then basically used as the basis for making their decision.

So, you know, one option would be of course for you to use the same evaluation sheet. You know, we can look into – and I think Emily has already been doing some work on that – to see if we can actually translate this into a survey so it's easier for you to fill this online. Of course we can, you know, do it another way as well and define other criteria.

One thing that may be helpful, and we can pull it up in a second as well, is that we have an email from Tom Dale from the GAC Secretariat that he sent to James Bladel on a question of, you know, the feedback from the GAC Secretariat on, you know, what they see as, you know, important aspects of the liaison or whether, as well, areas to improve. So again, that may be another source of information that you may want to look at and then review the candidates aligned with, you know, the criteria that were in the call for applications but also the input that he has provided on what are, you know, important aspects of that liaison function.

So I just wanted to share that, you know, so you know how it was done in the past. As said before, of course that doesn't need to restrict you in any way in how you want to carry out this evaluation. So again, it's really up to you to decide how you want to take it to the next step.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And these questions seem appropriate. And, Tony, just to – for further information on the ranking of the candidates, we have to provide a motion by the motion deadline for the GNSO Council meeting but what we've done in the past is provided draft motion and it has to be submitted October 16. And we provide a draft motion and then we can sort of buy some time to continue our work if we're not done by October 16 and – in the final selection of the candidates so we could submit it like a week before the GNSO meeting. So it's, you know, it's on record for the motions and we put that deadline. So we have a little time but as you know, everything gets busy.

And so the evaluation sheet I think would be a good idea. Does anybody have any other questions that they would want to ask and include in the evaluation? And also, is the recommendations from the GAC Secretariat, is that on the wiki also? I must say I missed that.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. We haven't posted that yet because we're actually – we've reached out to Tom Dale to make sure that he's happy with us posting it. As said, I can put it up now in the Adobe Connect because, you know, I think he did send it with the intention of people being able to review that, but, you know, we would like to have his confirmation that we can actually post it. But as said, I'll...

Susan Kawaguchi: Oh okay.

Marika Konings: ...find it now and pull it up here.

Susan Kawaguchi: That'd be great. And I agree with Maxim, it was great to have – indicated which SGs and Cs have supported each candidate. I mean, we do

have that but it sounds like it may be limited. And someone also – I should go back to the chat – had said it would be great to have Carlos's input on the requirements – Maxim, that was your suggestion that, you know, if Carlos could have joined the call it would have been good to get his input on – since he's done this job – of what criteria we really should – if we're looking at all the criteria.

It looks like we are – people are agreeing that the evaluation questions are good so Emily, can we start by putting those, you know, creating the survey – obviously not on the fly here, for today, but. All right, just sort of skimming this email real quick.

Okay so not sure in this email that there's any other criteria that we'd want to add but so, Maxim, you're suggesting a draft poll that everybody could review the questions before the actual survey or poll is created? Yes, okay, that makes sense too. Usually I think Emily does.

Okay so if – I mean, I'm not sure I'm seeing – this is good background information. I'm not sure I'm seeing other elements that we should add in ranking. But if we can – if Tom Dale agrees to this being posted I think it'd be a good reference document for us. Okay, so I think our to-dos is – or Emily's to-do – and I must thank staff for all the hard work that you do on – for this committee. There's always something we're asking you to do.

So if you could create the draft poll and send that around and then we could just make a decision online and get that finalized, and then we should sort of target a date – well, I think the recommendation to have Carlos's input on what the role, you know, his experience with the role would be helpful in drafting that also so maybe we can make sure we get Carlos's attention on the criteria for the survey too. So as long as he weighs in on that and then maybe schedule another call where he could actually give us more input so, yes.

And, Maxim, Carlos was invited to this. He's representing Julf on the committee, he just – there may have been something that came up. So oh and Poncelet, good, he joined us. So I'm just wondering when we should have another call. Do you feel that we need Carlos's input before we fill out the survey? We can work on the draft survey to make sure – or a poll to make sure it has everything we think it needs to be and if we get his input via email that would be good.

And do you want to talk to Carlos prior to starting to evaluate each candidate or would it be sufficient just to – everyone do the ranking and then – but have Carlos's input as we discuss the candidates after we've seen a ranking? And that's a good idea too, Marika, we could ask him to weigh in on the email list too. And Maxim is saying, "Better prior to the vote."

People are typing. Okay, so definitely prior. So do we want to have a – just trying to figure this out. So we have two weeks before we're, you know, our October 8 date or – for deciding on the candidate, though we can push that out a little bit. So would you like to have a call next week and we can make sure that Carlos can make it? We could do a Doodle poll.

Okay, it looks like next week is fine. Several agree. Okay, so if we work on the survey this week, get Carlos's input on that as we work on it too, but then schedule a call were we know for sure Carlos can provide his input. Right, Maxim, we can do – we can sort of work around Carlos's schedule maybe, but we could do a Doodle poll – or Emily could do a Doodle poll for us. And then schedule another call for next week, get his input, do the ranking and then discuss the candidates the following week.

Does that sound like a plan? We will have two calls, one next week and the week after and hopefully. Okay, and Marika or Emily, is there anything else we should consider in the process for GAC liaison selection? Are we missing anything? Okay, she says no.

And Emily is tying. All right, and do we have any other business? The only other thing I can think of right now is that we do need to get – move forward on our – is it the charter or just the – Marika did make a point of that earlier that we need to...

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. I can help with that point if you want. So as you may recall, the charter for this group was actually adopted by the GNSO Council on a preliminary basis because you know, there was a relatively short time – timeframe to put it together, there were some changes made where I think the Council wasn't sure how that would actually work in practice.

So in the motion that they adopted, you know, adopting for preliminary the charter, they immediately indicated as well that they expected the SSC to carry out a review of the charter and provide feedback to the GNSO Council on whether, you know, within the framework of the charter it's able to undertake its activities, you know, whether there are any areas where improvement or changes may be needed so that that feedback then can be considered by the GNSO Council in view of, you know, any potential changes to the charter following which it could be kind of permanently adopted.

So Emily has actually already been putting some thought into that so we hope to be able to kind of give you a framework that, you know, takes you through the charter and then highlights indeed how some of that was applied practically in the recent selections. And hopefully that will then give you the opportunity to give you indicate, you know, is more guidance needed in the charter? You know, are some aspects limiting or, you know, does it actually work pretty well?

So again that's I think the exercise that, you know, once you've completed this you know, we can start looking at that. I don't think there's any urgency in that regard especially as well since I don't think there's any imminent selection weighting. But having said that, of course, you know, taking care of that before anything else shows up will be helpful because it means that you'll

have a permanent charter and there's ability as well to address any aspects where you believe maybe further guidance is needed or, you know, updates are required to make sure that you have the flexibility to do your work.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And that's very helpful that you and Emily are already looking at that to give us some thoughts on that. So we can put that off until after the GAC liaison selection is completed, correct? Okay. All right, does anybody else have any other business they'd like to bring up? And I think we're done for the day. I think we have a road plan. Yes, that – Rafik, I hear you. I feel like that's what I do. Mainly what I do lately, begin and end my day with an ICANN call. But thank you for being on the call.

And five hours, oh, that's a lot of ICANN, Maxim. All right so I think we're done. If anybody doesn't have any other business to bring up. And just look for emails and the Doodle poll for a call for next week. Thanks so much.

Marika Konings: Thanks, bye.

Susan Kawaguchi: Bye.

Maxim Alzoba: Bye all.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, everyone. Today's meeting is adjourned. Verizon Operator (Angelica), can you please stop the recordings and disconnect all lines. Everyone, have a great day.

END