ICANN Transcription

GNSO Standing Selection Committee

Monday, 24 June 2024 at 19:00 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/owCHF

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

JULIE BISLAND:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Monday, the 24th of June, 2024. We had no apologies submitted. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public Wikis pace shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking, and as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. And with that, I will turn it back over to Karen Day. Please begin, Karen.
KAREN DAY:	Thank you, Julie. Hi, everybody. Good afternoon, good evening, good morning to those of you in the AP. This is Karen Day, and welcome to our first session of this iteration of the Standing

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.

Selection Committee. I really appreciate everybody being here, I really appreciate everybody volunteering to do this, as it looks like we're going to have some interesting discussions coming up. We've got great community participation for both of these positions from what I'm hearing. So let's dive right in, and I'm going to turn this over to Julie H., and she's going to walk us through processes and procedures, and then we will take questions and make sure we're all squared away to dive into the first analysis project we've got. Thanks, Julie. Go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Great. Thanks, Karen, and welcome, everyone. So you'll see from the agenda, we've got a couple of selection processes upcoming. The first one is when we're going to start, well, basically today, and that's the pilot holistic review selection process, and I'm shortly going to switch to that wiki. And the second one is the GAC selection process, which we'll also run through, just to remind everybody, we did do it, I think back in March, we walked through the process, but we'll do that again, and then we're going to try to see if we can agree on some times for our next meeting. So hang on while I switch screens momentarily.

All right, this is the pilot holistic review. This is a new review, one that no one has done before. So this is just starting and it's a new thing. So it's new for, although it is new, it is also governed by bylaws, and the bylaws have some specific rules governing all reviews, this being no different than those discussed in the bylaws. So we do have some guidelines on how to conduct this review. So I think let's just run through quickly what the bylaws say so we can understand what we've got in front of us. I mean, you,

not staff, of course. So let me just move down the page just a little bit.

So each supporting organization, this is in section 4.6 of the bylaws, may nominate up to seven prospective members for the review team. So we have 19 candidates, and we can nominate seven of those. Any supporting organization nominating at least one, two, or three prospective review team members shall be entitled to choose to nominate those members. I think we're going to have our full seven. I think we're going to find we have more, we may have more qualified candidates than we have space for, and then any that has not nominated, there are at least three candidates. So we're still responsible for the determination of whether all 21 members shall be filled. So there is, and you'll see as I move down the page here, there is an option for the SOs and ACs to approve the final, the final slate of candidates. So not only will the GNSO nominate seven prospective members, the GNSO along with the other SOs and ACs will have the opportunity to approve the final slate of 21 candidates. So the bottom line is we have 19 candidates, we select seven, and here are the candidates listed here, and they're also in the Google Doc that we put into the chat. And they're also in the evaluation poll that we'll use, and I'll get to that in a moment. So let me just go on down the page. That's quite a few candidates. Their applications are all there at the PDF link.

So, as of updating this wiki, we didn't officially have the candidates sent to us. Thanks to Jothan's sleuthing, we have the list of candidates. So we have received the EOIs, so that second step is taken care of. The day is our kickoff meeting. Basically starting

today, well, really tomorrow when we send you the evaluation poll, you can start today if you like. You look at these candidates and start thinking about how you want to rank them. And then the July 8th deadline is the deadline for motions and documents for the 18th July council meeting. So this is important to note. We have a motion, we'll have a motion ready to submit to the council whether or not there are names to submit. Now we have a meeting to be scheduled for next Monday, July 1st, with the anticipation that the SSC will make its determination of the nominees to recommend to the council next Monday. And then there will be a three-day consensus call. That's why the line above lists 3rd July. That's a consensus call. The SSC has to decide by full consensus. So what we do have is a little bit of leeway in our process. We can submit a motion on the 8th without names as a placeholder and still fulfill the obligation of having a motion submitted. So if we need to, we could have an extra meeting on the 8th. So next Monday, depending on the determination of the SSC, the next Monday we can decide whether or not we need additional time in an additional meeting. Hopefully we can submit the names pretty much right up to the time of the 18th July meeting, but it would be nice not to cut it that close. And also then we're going to run into the next selection process, so we don't really want to do that if we don't have to. I'm going to pause here for a moment, just looking at the chat to see if there are any questions.

KAREN DAY: Julie, do we have a calendar invite for the first?

JULIE HEDLUND:	We don't. We've got that on the agenda. That's a little bit, I've sent a revised agenda just about a half an hour ago. So we will hope to select a time for that meeting in the first and the meeting for the GAC selection process, which is the 15th. And if we need to, we could also have a meeting for the 8th as well. So the goal is to have the council make its selection--essentially, they're just confirming our list of candidates on the 18th. So, and then what happens, just noting that there is the overall [PHR] process, which has a step further down the line where the SO and AC chair select review team members. And identify the real leadership from the list of nominated applicants. So that gets whittled down to, well, the 21. But I think we still get our seven as part of that. And just for your reference, here is the call for volunteers. And that has the skill set. And the description of what is the pilot holistic review. And the skill set will be part of the evaluation poll. So you'll be able to use that to rank the candidates. And that's pretty much it.

What I'd like to talk about just briefly is the candidates. So we have 19 candidates. They are submitting their applications as individuals. They are not submitting as an endorsed candidate. Just from a particular stakeholder group or constituency. And that's important. You'll note the application doesn't have a place for someone to indicate their stakeholder group or constituency. And so this group, the SSC is not [inaudible] to evaluate whether or not each stakeholder group or constituency has a particular candidate. Because these are individuals and considered based on their qualifications alone. So that will be different. I'm mentioning that because it's different from what the GAC liaison process will be. The liaisons candidates cannot submit as individuals. They have to submit as part of an SG or C. So that is

notable. And that is part of their application that this group will be looking at. I don't think we're going to have 19 candidates really at GAC liaison. So I'm going to pause there and see if we've got questions. Looking at you, Jothan. You've been helpful so far.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I do have some questions. So I had asked in the chat, this is super helpful, all this additional advanced work, and this is super organized. I think in looking at the individual PDFs, and I noted this on the list, that we're looking at additional fields that exist within each of the PDFs. And so I wanted to find out if there's a version of this spreadsheet that was shared, the Google Docs spreadsheet that might contain some of those extended details that are in each individual PDF, so that we don't have to actually go into all the different PDFs and do that. So that we can look at the different attributes of each of the candidates and their submission answers, so that we can, I think, do our process. And Karen has her hand up. I would be glad to shut up and let her talk on this one. Thank you.

KAREN DAY: Thank you. So I'm not going to try to answer for Julie. If they have already extracted some of this detail into another spreadsheet, that would be fantastic. But on the assumption, excuse me, that they have not, what I have found helpful for myself is I have, I create a spreadsheet with these, the criteria that Julie helpfully listed on her spreadsheet that she circulated. I cut and paste them here in the chat. And I just go through it as I'm looking at each application, literally with pencil and pen and make tick marks and,

you know, sometimes I do it, you know, give everybody one to three, give everybody a one to five, or just yes, they meet this or no, they don't in a spreadsheet and then look at how that calculates out. And Julie says she has not extracted all that information. So, Jothan, I think we are going to be either clicking on 19 PDFs online or printing out 19 pieces of paper if you're really old school like me and sit down with your pencil and figure it out. So anyway, I just want to offer that I, I use that criteria. I personally don't look at. I know we're, we strive for diversity. I personally look at the gender and the geographic locations of the individuals after I've done the scoring. But be glad and interested to hear from others if they think it should be weighed differently.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. And that's very helpful. Yeah, my only concern is it would take quite a bit of time to populate the spreadsheet with the information from each of PDFs and time is not something we have a lot of, unfortunately. So I'm afraid that if staff took the time to populate the spreadsheet, we're not going to be able to have the materials ready for you to start doing your evaluation for at least a few days, I would say. And we'd like you to be able to get started on the evaluation. And keep in mind too that another tool you have to use—you can use, you don't have to use—is a poll or survey. There's a Survey Monkey survey. And it's not quite ready for prime time, it needs to be fully changed over to this particular review process. The candidates are in there, but there's a few other details like the skill set that's not in there. And the poll allows you to say whether or not the candidates meet the skill set, and then allows you to rank the candidates. And it's a tool only it's not

required. We'll send it, we'll open it tomorrow and send it to everyone. And then you can use it or not. The main evaluation process will happen next Monday when we all sit down and talk through our choices and see if we can come to a consensus on seven top candidates. So, let me just look at the chat here and see. Sorry. Yeah. We didn't get [inaudible], that would have been nice. I'm not sure whoever created them all. But with the fact that they are in PDF makes them a bit more difficult to work with to track the data. So I hope you can use them in the old school format. So that we can get started a little sooner. Or a lot sooner as it may be. So ready for more questions.

KAREN DAY: Julie, is it your team, this team that's on the call here that creates the applications, the expressions of interest forms or is that somewhere else within the org? Because I'm just wondering about, can they be done in a format, like a Google survey or something that would actually go ahead and extract the data and put it into a spreadsheet as it comes in?

JULIE HEDLUND: This particular process, the pilot holistic review is not run by our policy development team. The GAC liaison is. [inaudible] for that work. I think we get the form and Julie be correct me if I'm wrong. I think the format that you will submit in is in the word format. This is not that. This is another group doing this. I'm not sure who is doing it actually. I think they're probably using SurveyMonkey because SurveyMonkey is now the survey tool that ICANN is using. I'm not sure the outputs from SurveyMonkey may only allow PDF as an

output. I can ask and see if we can get this in a different format. I'm sure I can figure out who's running this particular process, one or another. I'm just not sure if something other than PDF is an option.

KAREN DAY: Yeah, that's a conversation maybe you and I can have at a meeting sometime with some of the tech staff about is there a way to bring some conformity to the way ICANN does these things so that everything that, you know, comes in, it just, it will make it easier in the future for people who have to process it. But again, it's just, you know, that's a conversation we can have another day.

So, anyway, Jothan is commenting about the high participation from Africa, lowest from North America. This is upside down from typical. Yeah, I know I did notice that myself too. I haven't looked at, well, I guess we haven't gotten the list of GNSO, GAC candidates yet. But anyway, I'll stop babbling there and let Julie move on with her agenda.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think that was all I have for the pilot holistic review, just taking more questions.

KAREN DAY: Are we going to set a deadline or can we set a deadline for having the survey in a couple hours before the meeting so we can have time to look at it?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, that's a great point. It won't take very long for the output. But I would say a couple hours before the meeting. Now, of course, we haven't set a meeting time. But I see that Jothan has his hand up.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, so I wanted to ask, there was one interesting element that came to my mind as I started reviewing the candidates is we're doing two separate reviews here. And the question I had is, would we see the candidates also for the GAC liaison role? And is there any overlap between the two sets of volunteers or people who have stepped up? Because I might want to factor in the selection process, you know, potentially not assigning the same person to both, if that's appropriate.

KAREN DAY: Jothan, the deadline for getting nominations to council is not until July 8th, and that's the deadline we're supposed to have this one turned in. So I don't see that we're going to have time to do a comparison.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, and I frankly don't think there is an overlap or I think there won't be an overlap.

KAREN DAY: I think there will be. I already know that there will be. But I also know that people are aware of what they're putting their hands up for and are doing it, you know, fully aware and can handle both if they get both.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that insight, Karen. All right, I see Segunfumi has his hand up.

SEGUNFUMI OLAJIDE: Hi, everyone. Just a question and also an observation at the same time. While I agree with everybody else regarding having to rank capabilities first, the other twist to it is that I noticed there are about five regions from where every applicant actually comes from, right? We have two from North America, we have seven from Africa, we have five from Europe, three from Latin America, and two from Asia. So in the case where we rank capabilities first, which is fantastic, right? What if most of the seven high ranked capabilities are from the same region? So how do we cover diversity in this case?

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, there's no requirement to take into consideration diversity factors. Of course, encouraged. But I think that the primary consideration is qualification. So I think that ideally you would have qualified candidates who also lend themselves to the diversity factor. Of course, that remains to be seen once we get into the evaluation process. But I think the intent is to look at qualifications first and then consider the diversity factors. But there

are no specific guidelines for how we are to make our choice. So there's a certain level of individuality to this choice. So it will be a very interesting discussion next Monday to see where we will land on the various candidates. I don't know if that's particularly helpful. I hope so. Are there any other questions before we go to the GAC liaison review process?

All right, I'm going to switch to the GAC liaison process to remind you of that. And then we'll talk about scheduling our next meetings. So the GAC liaison will take up position in ICANN 81. We're looking to have the selection complete pretty soon for the August council meeting. So ahead of schedule, because we want to have some time for overlap with Jeff Neuman, who is the outgoing liaison.

So moving on down to the process timeline. And as noted, we don't have candidates yet because the deadline is the 8th. We'll send out a reminder, I think, today or tomorrow for the SOs, SGs and Cs' chairs. So the deadline for the EOIs is the 8th. And so then the SSC will receive the candidates on the 9th. So we're going to schedule a call on the 15th. And then following that, prior to that, on the 9th, there'll be a poll that will open for you to evaluate the candidates and rank them. And then we'll meet on the 15th and there'll be a 48-hour consensus call. Again, the SSC makes its decisions on full consensus. It means we all have to agree. And then we will let the candidates know the preliminary decision. And then we'll submit our recommendation to the council as a motion by the 29th of July. And that is motion and document deadline for the August 8th meeting, which was an early meeting in the month. And so the council will confirm on the 8th the SSC's

candidate choice and we'll confirm the candidate to GAC leadership. And then the candidate will take up that role on the 14th of November, which is the AGM. So that's that process. Somewhat simpler. This was the call for expression of interest that was sent to the SG and C leadership on May 30th. We gave extra time for the expression of interest because of the intervening ICANN 80 meeting. And then we'll send, as inevitable, send a reminder to get the candidates in by the 8th of July. And we'll go ahead and generate a spreadsheet for you all. And I think we should get hopefully the materials in word form. So I think Jothan will be able to generate a spreadsheet with the candidate details. I give this group a little less time to evaluate, but hopefully we'll not have too many candidates. So we'll try to do that and plan for that. All right. So are there any questions concerning this time? I see there's something in the chat. Let me check that out. Yes, thank you, Jothan. All right. Any questions with the GAC liaison selection process?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, it's not a question. So this is my second go at participating in the SSC. And I was here for the previous one where Jeff ended up being the selected candidate. And so I think the criterion, and there have been some changes, I think, in it since the last time. But I think we ended up with, I think we had to select from three, if I recall correctly. I don't know, the last one happened during the pandemic, and so much is blurry from result of the time passed, et cetera. But I think that the criteria is a little bit different and updated, but mostly the same. And the process was actually pretty

smooth. So it seems like it should go pretty easily. But we won't see any candidates until mid-July, right? Based off of the timeline.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, the criteria has changed very slightly. The council did a review of the liaison job description, made a few tweaks to it. Not too many, though. I think it's going to be very similar to what you went through the last time for the candidates. And you're right, hopefully, it'll go smoothly this time around as well. So if there aren't any more questions, I guess what we'd really like to do is tie down the times of the meetings on the 1st and on the 15th. And if need be, we can throw in a meeting on the 8th if we cannot make a decision on the 1st. But we should try hard to make a decision on the 1st. So what I'm wondering right now is whether or not this time, 19:00 UTC, works as a time for folks next Monday and then on the 15th. If not, then we'll do a doodle poll to find times. But it's always good if we have a time that works for folks. Oh yeah, Karen, that's a good point. Maybe we should go ahead and do a poll anyway. Excuse me. Sorry about this. Okay. Let's go ahead and do a doodle poll. We'll have to do a pretty quick poll to pick a time for next Monday. And we'll do one for the 15th. But to see if we can get a time that works better for everyone. All right. So, any other business that anyone needs to discuss or any other questions? Remmy has come back and joined us. We'll wait and see if he has any questions. We'll come back. We were just finishing up. Jothan, go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Julie, I wanted to just thank you for all the work you're doing on this. This is great. And your experience at this is really keeping us going. So, it's really, really appreciated. I think, you know, the attendance this week, so there are some sort of meetings with a typical cadence that occur every two weeks. And I think by offsetting it by a week when we're meeting on the first and kicking that off, we'll see a little bit more engagement from people. So, as soon as I see that doodle poll, Julie B., we'll get a response back really quickly. And I think that'll really get us into the depth on this. And then I think the next meeting after that was two weeks past that. So, I think we'll see a better attendance on this call in the next meeting. Thank you.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Thanks, Jothan. I hope you're right. That was good. I have Remmy, and then Segunfumi.

SEGUNFUMI OLAJIDE: Upon my review of the candidates, the first one of the few candidates I reviewed, I realized that the name on the listing is different from the candidate name on the application form. And that is Marie Pattullo or something. So, I need to clarify which of them, because the SOI is pointing to a different person, I guess.

JULIE HEDLUND: let me check that. And in the meantime, Remmy, you had a question?

REMMY NWEKE: As the meeting was about to start, my network started misbehaving. So, I couldn't actually participate. But I wanted to ask, are we still expecting a spreadsheet as proposed by Jothan sometime within the weekend? I don't know if it has been discussed or something, but are we still expecting that with those information at least? Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm not sure I understood your question.

KAREN DAY: Remmy, we did talk about that during, sorry, one of the times that you weren't with us. We don't have a spreadsheet with the data extracted from the PDFs for this particular task where you're going to have to look at the individual PDFs ourselves. But Julie and I are going to work proactively on talking to staff about future efforts that can collect the information and automatically put it into a spreadsheet like a Google form to make it a little less burdensome going forward. But for this particular one right now, we've got 19 PDFs that we'll have to look at individually.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, sorry about that. What we have for PDFs are not easy to extract the information. I'm sorry, but I'm trying to run the PDF for Marie Pattullo. That's giving me trouble. You were saying that the name on the PDF didn't match Marie's name? Okay, because I'm wondering if they're giving us the wrong PDF. Let's see.

KAREN DAY: Julie, [inaudible] is saying it's just a misplaced vowel. So she's fixed it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. All right. So it is correct. All right. Thank you. All right. Any further questions? We will open the poll that you can use the tool. Go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: So my question would be, if somebody did take the initiative, is it okay for them to do the cut-paste effort and lift all the information from these and put them into that shared Google Doc? Or is it preferred since it might be sensitive information, although it's shared publicly, would there be any restriction from that?

JULIE HEDLUND: No, it's shared publicly. And one of the questions people ask is, in the form that people have to complete, is the permission to share the information for data protection rules. It's certainly a cut-and-paste party. If you want to have a cut-and-paste party, you're welcome to it.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Let me look at the difficulty on that, and maybe I'll take a stab at that if I have some cycles between now and then. If we're sharing the spreadsheet, I might need permissions and or I just wanted to make sure it wasn't—because it does contain potentially personal

information, but it looks like people have said this is fine in the document.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. ICANN wouldn't have been able to post it otherwise.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Is this spreadsheet just work product only seen by this group, or would it be something that would be stored publicly as part of the wiki?

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, it is seen currently by anyone who has the link, so we prefer that you not throw the link around. But then again, keep in mind that the PDFs, yes, they're out there for all. Anybody can go on the wiki to see those. So there's not really anything confidential in this document. There's a column for ranks. That's something you could use after the fact. Still, not really a huge deal.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Let me look at the level of effort involved and see if it's something that maybe there's something could be automated or exported and see if I can get that data over into the spreadsheet for us to use collectively. Because I think it'll save us all individually quite a lot of time. As much as I love printing these out and making little pencil notes. It might be helpful. I'll take a look at that and see if it's possible to contribute that volunteer work.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, that would be immensely helpful. Don't feel obligated, but if it's something you can automate in some way that isn't a great deal of difficulty, I'm sure it would be very much appreciated by others during their evaluation.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I'm going to look at it this afternoon, Remmy. So I'll send a note to the list if I have some success. Just watch the mailing list, I guess, would be the suggestion. Thank you, everybody.

JULIE HEDLUND: Anything else anyone who wants to add? Well, Karen, I think we're back over to you.

KAREN DAY: All right. Thank you, Julie. Thank you, everybody. We will be on the lookout on the list for a doodle that we will quickly respond to. And for those of you listening to the call, by the time you get this recording, you should also have a doodle. So please respond ASAP so we can get our meeting set for the first. God bless you, Jothan, if you're going to actually do this cut and paste job. And we'll buy you a drink in Istanbul. Appreciate it very much. But that's all I have. And I look forward to chatting with you again on the first.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks so much, Karen. Thanks, everyone, for joining, for those who have joined. And thank you for your helpful questions and help, Jothan. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]