

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Thursday, 25 January 2018 at 14:30 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group call on the Thursday, 25 January 2018 at 14:30 UTC. 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.

Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/Uge8B> Recordings may be found at:

<https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnsso-ssc-25jan18-en.mp3> and

<https://participate.icann.org/p1zyhni16x7/>

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee Meeting taking place on Thursday, the 25th of January 2018. On the call today, we have Osvaldo Novoa, Rafik Dammak, Susan Kawaguchi, Poncelet Ileleji, and Maxim Alzoba. We have listed apologies from Erika Mann, Frederic Guillemaut, and Marika Konings. From staff, we have Emily Barabas, Michelle DeSmyter, and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I'll turn it back over to Susan Kawaguchi. Please begin.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Terri and thanks, Michelle, for all your help in supporting this, and Emily. So good morning, good evening, good afternoon. I hope you all had a good New Year's and we're almost into February, which is amazing to me. Are there any updates to SOI?

I guess not and it looks like Osvaldo has a -- not here. I'll let Terri work on that. So if you see the slides on the -- I'm hoping everybody has control of the slides but one of our responsibilities this morning, the main responsibility would be to look at the matrix of skills of the existing SSR2 review team members and then review the candidates that we have left from the selection of the seven candidates we originally supposed. And we have two interested candidates remaining, Scott McCormick, and I'm not going to say his name, but Rao. And so we need to review those two candidates and compare those to the existing skills matrix and see if we can figure out which of the two are the best candidate.

We could make a decision, I guess, to go back and review all of the candidates that we didn't select the last time but it seems that if we spent the time to have Scott and Rao be in that top seven that we would focus on them. Okay, so Osvaldo is phoning in so I don't want to go too far with this. Has anyone had a chance to look at the skills matrix and review what you think are the skills we're looking for, for this team? So the skills matrix was included in the handout materials and I did review it, and it looks like they're fairly well balanced in my opinion. They had, I don't know, almost 40 different categories that they assessed themselves in and there doesn't seem to be any category that has no person in it, unless I'm reading the chart wrong. Poncelet says I think the review on the skills matrix suits all criteria. We shall look into it. So Renata, thank you for joining us.

So we will -- so in that skills matrix, if there was a glaring lack in a category than I think we should focus on that. That would make sense to me but if others have thoughts. I'm just not seeing it as I review it and hopefully you all can maybe pull it up right now and look at it. So we have the two candidates and reviewing the SOI for those candidates -- let's go back here to the -- so we have Rao Naveed Bin Rais, I probably murdered his name, and then Scott McCormick left.

In looking at both of their resumes, and their letters, and their statement of interest, it seems like we have distinct candidates here. Rao is very much academic and a professor and has been for quite a while. Let's see how long he's been, since -- he also worked as an engineer and then has now currently a professor it looks like at Temple University of Science and Technology in Pakistan. He would also fulfill a geographic diversity.

Scott McCormick is more of a security professional, and this is my assessment, and everybody should make their own, but just to review, he seems to have a military background or working with the military and looks like he was in the Air Force for a few years. And he has consulted and worked for a variety of companies as a cyber -- either cyber policy consultant or a technical advisor, security officer, chief security officer, and now runs his own consulting firm.

And so mostly, I think most of his customers are the government but he has a strong background in actual cyber security and sort of in the trenches. So does anybody have any thoughts on what we're looking for? So Renata's asking, we have to choose one of the two, right? Yes. There's possibility that they'll come back, the SSR2, and say they need another candidate after this because they're trying to broaden the team. And as you all know, they're suspended right now.

Emily, you have your hand up.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. This is Emily from staff. So one possibility in terms of a path forward for this if folks are not quite ready yet to make an assessment is that we could ask for one or two volunteers from the group to do an initial assessment of each of the candidates' resumes against this list here and essentially sort of check off where they -- and then have the rest of the group validate that and determine whether they agree with the rough assessment and then we can line that up with the existing skillsets as a group and fill any - - even though it's not clear from just looking at it that there are obviously

gaps, it's possible that it will be more clear to see how they line up the little Xs with the existing candidates.

So that's one possibility. And if we don't have volunteers from the group, staff can of course assist with that exercise as well. So that's just one way to potentially move forward.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's actually a good idea. My concern would be -- I mean I wouldn't even mind doing that but I'm not sure I could. I'm not sure I understand enough from their letters and their resumes and SOIs to be able to -- some of this I could. But on other things, I'm not sure I could. Maxim, you have your hand up.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. As I understand, according to the charter of our group, all members need to review materials. Also, it would bring us more fair assessment because if some members make reflection, other members might fall under influence of the initial assessment.

Also, my thinking is we might try the same approach we tried with the similar selections is to create (unintelligible) and to check which constituency providing they will (unintelligible) is thinking which person fits better. For example, if we talk about contractual compliance, who is better suited, one candidate or another, et cetera, et cetera. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: I would agree with in the past we've used the polls and we could go back to -- we've all done -- pretty much, I think the team hasn't changed that much or at all. We could go back to the original polls we all filled out and look at how these two candidates ranked in those or we could just do that work again just looking at the two candidates.

And I should have thought of this before but didn't -- so Emily, can you remind us what the poll questions were, just the broad categories not the actual questions.

Emily Barabas: Hi, Susan. Thanks. This is Emily. So I think the poll is quite a bit higher level than the skills matrix. So it was more about -- more focused on if you see here on the poll there's a couple of sections that are about the criteria mentioned in the call for volunteers. So it's kind of the first section. And I believe that the poll simply sort of said how do the candidates line up with the criteria in the call for volunteers.

So it was a much higher level poll. So we could potentially do a different poll with all of the items in the skills matrix or we could repeat the poll at a very high level, although I think the task that the council gave to the SSC was to do a comparison with the skills matrix as opposed to making a recommendation at this time. Feel free to correct me if I'm wrong on that but that was my understanding. So I'm not sure if just making a recommendation of a candidate fulfills that request.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That is a good reminder is that we're really looking to see if either of these candidates fulfill empty slots or complement the team based on this skills matrix. So I think we all need to do the work then. I would recommend that we can each fill out this matrix for the candidate. Can we do that in a poll mechanism though, Emily? Would that be difficult for staff to put that together so that we would have all the skills. Go ahead, I'm sorry. I'm just droning.

Emily Barabas: Why don't we take that as an action item for staff to take a first stab at setting up a poll that would essentially allow each person to tick off in the skills matrix or the equivalent of the skills matrix, where they think the candidates fall. We'll circulate that as a draft and if people have feedback, they can provide it and then we'll open the poll.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And Maxim's saying please add other check fields so members would be able to express additional thoughts. Okay. So if we could, not to rush staff, but once you get it out then we should try to have

everyone fill out the poll, the matrix in the poll on the two candidates relatively quickly so that we can at least informally report back to the GNSO Council next week.

And then if they decide that yes, we need to pick a candidate, I think as you're going through the skill matrix, you should take the time to think about each candidate too and who you would recommend for the team -- actually being placed on the SSR2 team but we'll make that decision as a group after we see the skills matrix.

And Maxim is saying this week has overlapped with Names Con, yes, and the GNSO Council has their -- I don't know what it is -- we're having a planning meeting in LA and then there's also intersessional so a lot of us are pretty busy next week with (unintelligible). I've never been to Names Con so I don't know what that is, if that's what it is.

So at this point, Emily, is there anything else? Go ahead, Emily. You've got your hand up.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. I just wanted to touch base about timing. So you mentioned the upcoming council meeting. Was the intention that we would complete the poll and have another meeting before the council meeting? That seems like a pretty tight timeframe. Or was it the following counting that you were mentioning? Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: What I think I was really suggesting was that we at least say we're working on this and we are looking at the matrix, determining the skills for each of these candidates, and hopefully to have something to them soon is really what I was thinking for the next meeting, just a very informal update to them about the process. SSR2 still isn't resumed and I'm not sure there's any hope it will be resumed any time soon. But at least to give council an update that we're doing our part of it and we're so prepared. So not an actual here's your candidate or here are the skillsets that are needed.

Okay. So once again, we'll rely on staff to prep the work for us to do. You always make it easier for us and we appreciate that. Emily, is there anything else on the skills matrix or in reviewing the candidates that we should be doing? Okay. So she doesn't believe so. So everybody be prepared to, as soon as you can, if you can do that in the next week or so, review the skills matrix poll and fill it out, that would be really helpful.

So the other item on our agenda today was the review of the draft proposed revisions to SSC Charter and I know Maxim and I have both gone through and added comments or added to the charter in places that we found it needed. Did anybody else have any comments on the charter? Emily, please go ahead.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan. This is Emily from staff. So staff has started the exercised based on we received quite a bit of feedback in that matrix document that I think most of you have weighed in on at this point, which was essentially just asking for feedback on specific pieces of the charter one by one and kind of thinking about what edits might be needed. And there were some very consistent threads.

So staff went ahead and took a first attempt at -- and you'll see here line editing suggestions to the charter based on the feedback that we received from the group. And this just allows -- it's a little more concrete now and Maxim mentioned that we need feedback from other members too. So this is just another format that might be simpler for people to look at and think about what these edits actually mean. So we can certainly iterate on this.

So I think the next step is for people to review this document and also we can put this text -- actually, I'm not sure how this is going to look in a Google doc, but people can put feedback into the Word document or on the mailing list about these potential edits. Maxim says he has a comment. I'm just going to say one more thing about the high level bit about this. The piece that I think

we haven't fully discussed yet that would be helpful to discuss either here or on the mailing list is about transparency.

We received a number of comments that people were interested in making SSC deliberations confidential until a recommendation is made and it would be helpful to talk a little bit about what that actually looks like in practice and the rationale behind it. Currently, the mailing lists are automatically publically archived. Notes are posted online. Recordings and so forth and that's both for members themselves if they haven't attended or want to review materials, but also as sort of a public transparency default for the work that we do.

So that would be helpful to have some feedback on that either here or on the mailing list. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, Emily. And yes, there were some concerns there. Let's go to Maxim first and then we can discuss that because I do have some questions for you on that one. Maxim? So I don't know if you want to speak. Go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. It's about the comment to the almost on the end of Page 5 of the shared document. It's about concerns that we should deliver consensus point of view but I noted that we are trying to describe situation when members have a deadlock for some reasons. So the situation needs to be reported to prevent situation of stalemate where nobody knows what to do. And we need to investigate all options and report to GNSO Council so they can make weighted judgment on what to do next.

So it's the reason for minority views, et cetera, et cetera. It's my point of view. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that makes sense. Emily, you have a response to that?

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Maxim. This is Emily. Just to clarify what that would look like in terms of the edit, so you're saying to keep the text that says as well as minority views should be -- these exist to speak to the fact that the SSC may reach deadlock and not be able to make a full consensus recommendation, which is discussed earlier in the edits. Thanks.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Yes, it's, for example, hypothetically we have a situation when one constituency sees something as an improvement of the situation and, for example, other constituencies see something as something not very good for the ongoing processes.

But in the end, the first option, they came to the conclusion that everything they can cope with their output resulting. But constituency A wants to add a side and say, but in fact, yes, we agree to that but due to this and this, there might be a need to review it on some other level in the future. Or for example, we would recommend to have more candidates on hot seat or something like that. And the other option when constituencies have quite contrary views and thus no consensus point could be found. Then it's a description of the process and minority views of constituencies saying that yes, we agree with that but we cannot agree with this and here is the reasons. I hope it was more or less understandable.

Susan Kawaguchi: That makes sense to me and we've already had once or twice, and I think it was Lori Schulman, where we added some language to the motion just to indicate -- I can't remember what her point of view was -- but I remember we agreed to some language in the motions that in some ways was her minority view. She agreed. We had full consensus but she felt more comfortable with that.

So we have more homework. I agree, Maxim, we need Erika and Frederick's input also. So we need everybody's input. So staff sent this out. It was in the meeting materials agenda email. So if everyone could read through this and comment or sign off if you're fine with the language. Back to the

transparency question, I don't know what page that's on, Emily, but one of my concerns with the transparency is I just feel bad when the candidates can look to see what we've done but we haven't announced it formally. So they read a transcript or read the emails and go, oh well, I didn't make the cut. Instead of us formally reaching out to each of them and saying thank you very much but we've come to another decision.

So we have a responsibility to be transparent and I agree with that concept. I guess we just need another mechanism. Maybe once we -- immediately after we make a decision, we reach out to the candidates with a very standardized email and say thank you very much. We have chosen you or we haven't. But then we're in the position that we've told the candidates before we had gone to the GNSO who is really making the decision on these. We're just recommending candidates.

So Maxim? Page 4, I'm going to...

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, I think we might use something which is used by some constituencies. For example, we could have recorded the section of our conference call which is published in usual order and some sections, for example, we're having again the discussion of candidates for the choice B, yes, which can be published only after GNSO Council approves it after they make their decisions, et cetera, et cetera.

Thus, we will be able to stay transparent but we will not relay information which I'd say can greatly upset volunteers and prevent their participation. Because nothing worse than having announcement that you are the chosen one and reading stories that it was a (unintelligible) he was or she was not supported by GNSO Council. But on the other page, on the other hand, I think we need to stay in silent mode until the candidates are chosen to prevent some unhealthy situations, which affect our judgment and the resulting procedures of voting, et cetera, et cetera.

So my thinking is that both conference calls could have some closed sections, which are released to the wiki only after approval of GNSO Council of the particular candidate, of the particular choices. And the also mailings, some of them might need some tags saying that it's voting sensitive, for example, yes and they're published only after the choice made by GNSO Council. So we will stay both transparent and we will not interfere with the section process actually. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: That's a good recommendation. This is Susan for the record. What I don't -- well, the complication is, is that then we -- the communication to council with the motion with the four names, or three name, or seven name, excuse me, is then public. So eventually, we're still announcing to the candidate who made the cut. I guess at that point we could send them an email saying thank you very much, you made it or you didn't. Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, I think we need to clearly show in our message that each recommendation of SSC, it's selection made by committee, but it has to be approved by GNSO Council and their word is final. So they can clearly see from the message that they were pre-selected for the GNSO Council voting or GNSO council procedures because I'm not sure if it's voting or something else. And thus, it will not upset people because yes, you passed the pre-selection procedures established by the charter and now, you can follow what council does. And it seems both logical and quite transparent.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. And Emily, so what do you think of that idea? Will that fit into the rules of running the committee like this?

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Susan and Maxim. It's helpful to get a little bit of clarification about this. So I guess I'm still trying to understand regarding what the main concern is regarding the council. Is it that the council could potentially make a different decision than the SSC and that's why that's the point in which we

allow the information to be public? Because ultimately, if we're publishing the information, people are going to see those deliberations anyway if they seek them out. So that's one question is sort of the key concern that we're trying to control for. And then the other question is about logistics. I'm not actually aware of other working groups or GNSO groups that selectively redact emails from the mailing list temporarily and so forth. So I think that's something we'd need to look into more before we can say that that's an easy change to make. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I'll let Maxim go first and then I have a few comments for you. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. It could be done by establishing the mailing list. For example, SSC voting and which is published after the particular bunch of emails related to some process and this process if finished. It's my initial thinking with my IT background. So it's not published right away. And for the conference calls, some constituents, for example, registries, sometimes they, for example, invite guests which does have to be able to read history of the call or, for example, different audio recording, which might be released later. So it's a different file.

So the operator stops the recording for the first part of call, clears the history of the chat, and then starts the second part recording. And it could be released at later stage and file could be marked like load, you know, something, so you know that it shouldn't be published right away. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That does sound like that might be a mechanism that works. So ICANN community is very big on transparency, which we should be. So I don't know if that would raise some concerns. And Emily, my understanding of this is this committee recommends these candidates but the GNSO Council could -- once they see the motion and with the candidates that we've recommended -- they could definitely send it back and say no, we don't like your group of candidates. Do it again. Look again or review again.

So to me, just because we've made a decision does not cement those candidates as the actual team members. But -- and I just know that in at least one of the reviews, one of the teams, I can't remember which one it was, review teams that we were putting -- selecting candidates for that I got an email within an hour after our selection or maybe I'm exaggerating, maybe -- it was the same day anyway that we had made a decision and that they were disappointed. That they understood and they listened to the recording and was asking for -- it was more of a -- it was a friendly email but I felt awkward because we made this decision but we didn't communicate anything to the candidates.

But it could be that we're in a situation where we can't. It's just the way it is. Everything needs to be transparent and without sort of going through quite a bit of changes in the transparency, delayed transparency I guess is what we'd have. So that is a really good point, Emily, that perhaps making clear on the SSC wiki the role of the SSC would also help. And Renata is okay for making the list only private. I'm not sure we have that choice. I'm assuming everybody is reading.

So what I would recommend is everybody read I guess it's 4, Page 4 has most of the transparency, and come to some -- add any thoughts or edits into that that you would like to be considered. So I'm not sure just the voting -- well, I guess the voting would be if everyone -- if it was transparent that everyone could hear our deliberations on the candidates or review of the candidates and then we actually vote on a separate or the polls -- however we decide to do it -- is a separate list.

So that's a consideration for the polling, Emily. We use polls a lot just in the RDS PDP. Everybody submits their polls and at the end, everything is published. I don't think you see the actual polls that people -- well, is that how it works right now with the polling? Like if I submit my answers to a poll then you put those into a document.

Emily Barabas: What I meant was that if people wanted discussion about the results of the polls to be non-public, it could be people emailing other individuals in the group but I guess that sort of circumvents the whole point of transparency and archiving the list. Bring that out there but that might not be the way to go.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, what I don't want to do is -- I mean right now, it's full transparency and maybe we have to live with that, though I think we could at least send an email to the candidates saying we've considered your application and sent our recommendations to the GNSO and then they could go look if they want to. I'm not sure how to get around it.

So I think this will take a little bit more thought and what I don't want to do is violate any of the rules for running a committee like this and our work. So Renata is saying I think halfway solutions are awkward. Either we have full transparency or not and I think we're required to have transparency. So Maxim is saying if we do not find a way to properly design delayed output model, we might continue the usual way of the SSC.

So why don't we all give it a little bit of thought and as you review this document, if you have any thoughts on how we could get past this hurdle or we just live with it and be more considerate of sending a notification quickly to the candidate, not really saying they made it or they didn't make it in, but that we've reviewed -- because I'm not sure that there's any communications from our committee to the candidates really. It's usually to the GNSO.

So Maxim, please go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think we might need to return to the timeline diagram we had with the steps and days to understand where do we want to make notifications, to send notifications, et cetera, et cetera. So we might fight the procedural way to avoid all these hassle with hidden messages, et

cetera, by making proper notification on right time. And thus, yes, it will simplify our life I think. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that's a good idea, Maxim. So I'll take a look at that too and see if we can add a step or something or maybe we do have a process that works fine and we leave it as it is. And Renata makes a comment, it's only real anyway once the GNSO votes on the motion. All right, so we have a few bits of homework. One is to do the skills matrix for the two candidates, Scott and Rao, and then the other is to review this charter and we should try to wind this charter up sooner than later. And it looks like next week that we have a -- everybody's pretty busy with Name Con and other things. So we'll send out a doodle poll for the following week to see if we can find a time that works for everybody.

Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, I think when we're talking about this timeline and place for notifications, we also might need to look into the text of disclaimer saying (unintelligible) notification, you successfully passed initial review for consistency for example, recommendation selection process. Then you pass second stage of approval of constituencies for support. And then you passed final selection. It's (unintelligible) but it doesn't mean that you're finally chosen. You need to see the output of GNSO Council and the careful and clear messages would simplify our life and the life of candidates and we'll bring in more clarity to the process without actually concealing all of the text. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay. That's actually a really good recommendation too just to -- and Emily had recommended we add some clarity on the wiki page but actually in an email to the candidates would be good too.

And Emily is saying perhaps the group can start with timely notifications and then if it encounters issues, look into further measures. Renata would like us

to look at the second week of February would be best for a meeting. So why don't -- we'll aim for a doodle poll for the second week of February. Is there anything else we're missing, Emily? Anything else I didn't cover? I'm looking at the agenda.

Emily Barabas: I think you covered everything, Susan, thanks. And thanks everyone for staying over time. I know it's been a bit over but it's great to get everyone to catch up. So thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: And I do appreciate that too. All right, so look for an email with just with the two bits of homework and we'll have another meeting in a few weeks. Thanks. Thanks, all. Really helpful today. Good discussion.

END