
ICANN Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee
Thursday, 17 September 2020 at 14:00 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. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/Dwa-C>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Standing Selection Committee meeting being held on Thursday the 17th of September at 14:00 UTC.

Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you were only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants 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 any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN's multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Julf Helsingius. You may begin.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Welcome to everybody and thanks for showing up. We seem to have a pretty good group together here. As you can see, the agenda is reasonably short and I think we can have an efficient meeting. Of course, the next formal thing is to ask if any of you have any SOI updates. Anyone with any updates?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I don't see any hands, so we can move into the actual meat of the discussion, reviewing the survey results. We seem to have them on screen. Great. Do we need to go through it point by point? Does anyone really feel the need to discuss any of the points? Maybe we should, but I assume you all read the material and saw the results, and I don't think there are any big controversies anywhere. But does anyone have any comments? Do you want to go through the whole thing or not? Any views, opinions?

LORI SCHULMAN: Julf?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, go ahead.

LORI SCHULMAN: Hi. I'm going to fully disclose that I did not read all the results, but I don't really feel the need to go through all the results. I would just ask, if you have or if Julie has, were there any big objections raised? That's what I would be interested in knowing. I believe we have a qualified candidate and the only thing I would want to know is, were there any reservations raised or concerns raised?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, and that's a very good question, because we all saw the numeric results but there were comments that weren't sort of publicized and so maybe if staff could just give some comments

on what the feedback through the comments was, or the verbal feedback was.

JULIE HEDLUND: Julf, I can speak to the comments.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes. Please do.

JULIE HEDLUND: Apologies to all, but I didn't circulate the comments. I thought one of them was just a teeny bit personal so I just didn't want to put it out on to the list because the list is actually publicly archived and available. So I have them now in front of us here, and if you like, I can just scroll through them. You can see them, is that correct?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes. Actually, before you go through it, there was one thing I forgot to mention, just a reminder to everybody that this is recorded and the minutes will be public, just so we're all aware of it. Thank you. Go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Julf. And just so you all note, yes, and it has been standard for transparency to record these meetings. And the notes also get published to the Wiki as well and sent around on the list. So we will continue with that standard for this meeting as well. So thank you for that, Julf.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Here are the comments. I'll scroll through them. But I hope you can see them. Let me just leave them up for a moment. If you want, I can read them, Julf. I don't know if you want me to just allow a little time for folks to read them.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yeah, I think we can just all read through it and I don't think you need to read them out aloud. Let's allow a minute or two for everybody to read through them.

JULIE HEDLUND: Great. Thanks. And I'll scroll down in a couple minutes because there's a little bit more that you can't see on the screen.

JOTHAN FRAKES: If I could comment—and I think I'm probably repeating what Lori said, but saying it a little differently. It seems like we're selecting from a pool of one person, and this is a person who has demonstrated, from my perspective great qualification. I would just really be, for the interest of time and efficiency, wanting to hear any maybe dissent or constructive criticism or concerns that might be voiced, because I think—I don't want to do anything inappropriate here where this is a matter of somebody being selected, but when we're working with a pool of one, I fear I'm

demonstrating too much of a bias for moving things forward or results. So hopefully that's not inappropriate, but I wonder if folks would support that concept here.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. I'm usually being accused of being too efficient, so trying to follow good procedure here. But I totally agree. What we're looking for here is if there are any showstoppers. I still think it's good for us, because we haven't seen these comments before, to just read through them. So far, the only negative one I have seen is a point about spelling mistakes in the application.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I really think that we should move it along here. We have one candidate. The candidate is well qualified. Most of us know the gentleman. Let's not [inaudible]. Let's move it along, please.

JULF HELSINGIUS: I'm okay with that. So basically, what we're now asking is, is there anyone who has major concerns? Because we don't seem to have any in the feedback. So at this point, anyone have a major concern with our candidate?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Julf. Hi everyone. It's not a concern, not at all. I just want to have one question, though. I subscribe to the [inaudible] regarding number two and the fact that Jeff was co-chair of SubPro. SubPro and the final report will lie heavily on our agenda

for next year. Should Jeff become a liaison to GAC, I think that will also be a major topic that will need to be discussed with GAC. I personally see this as a good thing, but I'd be interested if anyone would see this as a bad thing or a hinderance somehow. I don't think it is, but I just want to make sure that I'm not missing anything. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Yeah, of course, I don't think any of us speak on behalf of the GAC, but having actually watched Jeff interact with the GAC and be in the GAC sessions working on that thing, I think there is a pretty good chemistry and I think GAC is going to be—but this is just me speculating—very happy with our choice. But you never know with them.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I've seen Jeff interact with various SOs and ACs over the years of participating in ICANN business. He's well qualified, he's a measured gentleman, speaks very carefully, and tries his best to do the best with everything I've ever seen him do. So I actually didn't think of that idea that was brought up about the SubPro. I actually would think that that is an added [feather in his cap.] Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I have to completely agree. I just wanted to also maybe say exactly what Carlton said. Jeff has demonstrated to me almost a gold standard of community behavior and patience and seems exceptional for this role. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yes. Hi. I'm going to disclose that I wrote that comment on #2, and I want to say that I did think about both sides of this. I was wondering as I was thinking through all the work that Jeff has done, would this be perceived as some sort of aggressive move by the GNSO? Looking at the opposite lens. I honestly don't think so. I think that the time he took to balance all of the different concerns over the last couple of years, particularly on the geo terms name, which was a frontrunning issue at the GAC, I think he balanced it quite well. So I think that the GAC could potentially perceive this as a very lovely bridge from work that's already ongoing. And that's why I raised it.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. I see Rafik is next.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julf. Since everyone is supporting and want to move forward, I want to play here the different role, is the devil advocate. Just to raise some points. If you're going to make

decision, you should think about all the different sides. So doesn't mean that I'm against Jeff, but I think it's important to play that role of the devil advocate here.

So reading all the comments, and a lot of support and particularly emphasizing about the role of the SubPro and how he worked with the GAC, so my question here, how are we expecting him to be the GNSO council liaison to the GAC, or will he be more the GAC liaison to the GNSO council? And how he will represent the council liaison there? How he can be neutral. Even if he was the co-chair for example of the SubPro, he still needs to be [neutral] to talk about it in terms of process from GNSO council perspective.

So [I just want that] we should raise these points and be more careful. I mean, many good points are in Jeff's side, but maybe we need to think carefully here, and if there is anything to give guidance or something to have in mind. So again, this is just to be devil advocate since everyone is supporting. But maybe thinking from another perspective. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Rafik. I think that's a very good point, and thank you for taking that role. I've never been a very good solicitor for negative deities. You're doing a good job there.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I add something? [inaudible]. In ICANN, we have volunteers and we have "volunteers." This is a guy that I've seen have several jobs that would naturally put him in a certain camp based on the job role that he has. What I can say about this fellow is that

regardless of the job and where he's coming from, whether he's with the Contracted Party House or the Noncontracted Party House or whatever, he always seemed to be even keel. I have been in the ALAC how long, and At-Large, and he's interacted with us for quite a while. And I have not really seen much change in his demeanor or character based on the job he has, although you would be led to believe that since he has a job working for certain groups, maybe he would have taken on the colors of that group and been very pugnacious about it.

I did not see that. So I think in terms of his ability to manage and be collegial and so on, which is going to be the big thing for him in the GAC, I'm confident that he'd be able to manage it.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Carlton. Those are good points. One thing that Rafik mentioned that we might want to think about guidance we give him, one guidance could be to remind the chosen candidate that they are representing the GNSO, they're not representing the GAC. They are just a liaison.

Anyway, Jothan, you have your hand up.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

I do. I think I'd like to maybe say what Carlton said but say it with a different angle that may bring in some of what Rafik had raised, which is that I have witnessed Jeff demonstrate a good support and recognition of minority positions in hearing them out, which I think is very crucial given that the GAC frequently has minority

positions that are stated and can really demonstrate and manifest themselves.

And I've seen Jeff hear, listen and address—there are certainly many positions or things that are raised in the multi-stakeholder model which are kind of a common thought, but I've also seen and heard where there are minority positions that are very important to particular stakeholders and I've witnessed Jeff many times take the time to thoughtfully hear those out, interact and engage with the people who are raising them, and take the time to incorporate that into the greater dialog. And in this particular role with the GAC, I think that is something which will probably be quite necessary.

And to me, I was thinking, how can I be critical or think about things that might be detracting things or make suggestions or recommendations to Jeff on how he can do this role. And I believe authentically that we have somebody who has a great amount of capability here. I fear I'm sounding too enthusiastic, but in this particular case, it was very challenging to come up with things that I could offer as constructive criticism or concerns.

The only thing that I've seen—which has been raised, and I think addressed—is that Jeff has represented contracted party houses, .brands, registries, registrars. However, I'd balance that with what I stated about always being open and neutral to listening to a diversity of positions, majority, minority, otherwise, and bringing those in and incorporating I think what we aspire to in the multi-stakeholder model.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. So trying to get back to our efficient track here, is there anyone who has any real, actual concerns? I don't see any hands. I think we're all very happy with the candidate. We might possibly give a little bit of guidance in the direction that Rafik suggests, but even that sounds like there's not strong support for that.

So again, to cut things short, I think we can agree that we are okay with the candidate and happy to recommend him to the GNSO council. The only outstanding question is, do we want to give any guidance or not? Does anyone strongly feel this way or that on that one? Marie.

MAIRE PATTULLO: Thanks, Julf. I'm not sure that this would be official guidance, but I would strongly suggest on a practical level that if you have the time—and I realize this is cutting into your agenda—I think it'd be incredibly useful for you to give him a debrief to let him know what are the main issues that you've come across, that you might foresee being stumbling blocks or even positives. But I really think a handover, if you like, would be incredibly useful if you have the time. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Marie. And that's definitely in the plans. Of course, there'll be a proper handover and sort of discussion about what the issues have been and how to navigate them and everything. That's definitely in the cards. Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julf. Happy that just playing that role give maybe some way for more discussion. I think SC can propose something, but at the end, it's also the GNSO council will interact with the liaison and give—I'm not going to say instruction. That's not the kind of usual way, but it can give guidance. So I think the SC can suggest something. Doesn't need to be specific, but just to kind of encourage the GNSO council to give guidance to the liaison with regards to this and that. So just something high level, doesn't need to be quite specific. And I think the idea of handover will be helpful, because I think this is aligned with what also we are trying to do in GNSO council in terms of transition for the liaison. And since we kind of forget maybe to have something in particular for the GNSO council liaison to the GAC, so something maybe we need to take note of. Thanks, Julf.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Sure. Thanks. And actually to continue on the [tradeoffs] of handover, of course, it's now going to be a little bit harder because, had we gone ahead with this next meeting in face-to-face, we would actually have been there together through the whole thing in GAC meetings, and so I would have been able to comment on things going on. Now it's going to be slightly more challenging, but I'm sure we can find a way to sort of transfer knowledge and experiences.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excuse me, Julf.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you so much. I can go to agenda item four, which is to talk about the steps to complete the selection process. there are a few steps left to do.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: What staff will do is, following this call, we'll send a few notes around, and then we will send the formal consensus call. I know we do have all members on this call, but we do always send a consensus call message so that it's on the list and on the record, and we then ask if anyone has any objections. We could do so and ask people to respond by, say, this coming Monday, and if there are no objections, then we would go ahead and prepare the motion which we will send to Julf and Carlton, and we could send it to all of the members if you wish. The draft motion would then be submitted—once finalized—to the council consideration that would need to go to the council by the 11th of October in order to be considered at the annual general meeting on the 21st of October. And then of course, it moves to the GNSO council consideration at that point. Thank you.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. That's very helpful. Of course, technically and formally, if we think about it, that's actually put Jeff in the interesting position of he's actually only formally confirmed in position at the point when he kind of already had to be there and take up the baton. But yes, I think we can tell him that he's rather likely to be picked also by the GNSO council.

JULIE HEDLUND: Marie says ... Yes, Marie, unfortunately we are too late for next week's council meeting. Two things. First, we did have to extend the time of the selection process because there was a question, a clarification with respect to the process. And as Rafik has noted, we missed the deadline, and as Maxim notes, it's the 14th for the consideration for next week's council meeting.

But nonetheless, it's anticipated that the appointment enters into force after the AGM so the timing is then expected for the council to consider the motion at the AGM and then for Jeff to take over, as with the new council members, following the AGM.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Right. Thank you. And before I let Marie on, I'll just admit that it was slightly also a slip on my part. I was thinking of actually putting in a placeholder but thought that it wouldn't matter that much. But we probably should have put in a placeholder and that would have solved the problem. Marie, go ahead.

MAIRE PATTULLO:

Thanks. I completely understand what you're saying about timing. My consideration really is more practical than procedural, because it would be polite, nice, good, useful—choose from the above—if Jeff knew that we were more or less hoping that he steps into your shoes one second after you step out of them.

I don't know if it would be possible to have this go through by written procedure, to go through on the e-mail list. And then for example, if we show our intention and reasoning to council, here's the motion, if there are objections by—and here is a reasonable deadline—then we will of course actually come to a full discussion of this.

But my reason for thinking of doing it that way—and I realize what you're saying about council is coming in as well, but our new councilors know they're coming in. They were elected by the constituencies or stakeholder groups. So they know what is expected of them. And we can always unofficially [tip the wink] to Jeff, but we shouldn't be doing things that way. I think it should be clean.

I honestly don't know—and I apologize for not knowing this, Julie, I know I should—but if we can do it by written procedure on the list, then Jeff knows for a fact that he either has been voted in or is going to be voted in. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you. I see Julie wrote in the chat that the consensus call will be on the list which is public, and he can see it if he wishes. Of course, we can unofficially tell him that he should look at the list.

So I have Maxim and Rafik next. Rafik, is yours a procedural one or should I let Maxim go first?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

It's procedural, just maybe clarification here quickly. So we passed the deadline. Usually, the process is to have a motion and to have this, and—I forget which part. The consensus, that one in the agenda, I forget how to call it, sorry, that we just [vote him on it.]

So if you want to inform Jeff, it will be easy just to communicate as soon as possible to the GNSO council so that will be public and so you don't need to wait for the next deadline for the document and motion. So we can submit motion as soon as possible. Since the consensus call will finish on Monday, we can just send the motion and so it will be public and it will be in the agenda automatically for the October meeting. But since you have the motion submitted really early, the information will be public and Jeff will know that he will be 99% selected as the GNSO council liaison to the GAC. So I think [that makes it easy,] you don't need to communicate him or [inaudible] or anything, just submit your motion early.

With respect to what Marie's suggesting, if you go just on the list and maybe trying to get [vote,] I think for [electronic vote,] there is some deadline, so if I'm not mistaken, like ten days before notice, etc. So I don't see that much benefit, because at the end, it's the same thing, you will submit motion and the information [we know.] Just instead of approving during a public meeting, you will do it by electronic vote, and I don't think that kind of has the same effect. Sorry for rambling for a while.

JULF HELSINGIUS: No, this was useful. Thank you for the clarifications. So Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: About the role of liaison, actually, we have lots of documents helping liaison to fulfill their role. And since Jeff isn't known to read all documents from the beginning until the end, I bet he read it already. So I don't think we need to give guidance.

I just have a question from a formal perspective. If the motion— basically, it's too late to pass the motion, so it's not there, does it mean that previous person has to enjoy the AGM meeting in the previous role? Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: That's a good procedural question, Maxim. No idea. Right, anyway, we have missed the deadlines, we are where we are. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Julf, and thank you all. So just a reminder of the timeline. We haven't really missed anything. Of course, when we set up the timing and schedule for the selection process, we couldn't know that there would be only one candidate. And in any case, the changing of the guard, so to speak, happens at the AGM and so it was always anticipated that the motion would be presented for the council consideration at the AGM.

And to your question, Lori, no, the deadline has passed. There isn't flexibility to submit a motion once the motion document deadline has passed. But in any case, the SSC is precisely on time and on target. And the fact that you just had one candidate and finished up a little bit quicker is just something that happened, but otherwise, we are on schedule.

We can of course prepare the motion following the end of a very short period of time for people to register any objections on the list because the consensus call must be on the list, and we'll do that through this coming Monday. And then we can prepare the motion and it can be submitted early for the October meeting.

And also, we did just check the procedures, and Julf is confirmed officially "until the end of the ICANN AGM 2020." So Jeff could only take over after that.

And finally, we'll just note that Jeff is very good about keeping track of various groups and their notes and recordings and so on, and it wouldn't be all that surprising if he did listen to the recording of this particular meeting because that recording will be posted on the Wiki as is part of our transparency. And also, he of course can view the list where he can see that there's a consensus call, and assuming there are no objections, you would also be able to see that there would be no objection as well. So I hope that's helpful, Julf. Back over to you.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, and yes, very helpful, and I kind of repeat what I hinted at. There is of course a possibility that one of us tells him to

actually check the list or the recording. I'm not saying any one of us should do it or anything, but it could happen.

So I think procedurally, we're totally okay and I don't think we have, in practice, an issue here. I think we just go ahead and proceed as planned and just get the motion in as soon as possible. Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: So, is there a way—obviously, Jeff would likely participate anyway in anticipation of the outcome once he'd reviewed this. Is there an opportunity for him to ... We use the term shadow you in your participation. Or is there a way you're able to proxy him in your place for the AGM, give new have this strange missed deadline from three days ago that doesn't allow for him to be seated?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Actually, even if we had made that deadline, he wouldn't have been seated as far as I understand. I think the rules are still that I am holding the post until the end of the meeting. The way to shadow is that we will both be at the GAC meetings and the discussions, and I'm sure we can have sort of a private chat channel between us about what's going on. And we'll probably also have a call before the GAC meeting to get sort of lined up.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Thank you. Some of the procedures and details, I haven't followed as closely, so I appreciate learning this way through this process. So thanks for your patience with me on this.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Sure. No problem. Even those of us who have been following it are also confused, because there are a lot of rules. It's an especially complicated situation because we are dealing with both GNSO and GAC rules. So yes. But I think we have a pretty good path forward unless anyone sees a major issue with the way we're proposing to go forward. Anyone with any other concerns?

I don't see any hands, so I think we have agreement of how to proceed. So the only remaining point is—Julie is actually very helpfully typing what the steps are. The only remaining point is Any Other Business. Does anyone have Any Other Business they want to bring up?

I don't see any hands, so I hereby formally close the meeting and thank you all for participating. Too bad we didn't have more candidates so we couldn't have a really fiery debate and discussion and throw tomatoes at each other. But this will have to do. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Julf, for sharing, and thank you all for attending today. We will adjourn the meeting. Thanks again, and I hope you have a good morning, afternoon or evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]