
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Standing Selection Committee

Wednesday, 08 January 2020 at 1300 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 are posted on the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/UwhxBw>

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

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. This is the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Wednesday, the 8th of January 2020. On the call today, we have Julf Helsingius, Jothan Frakes, Marie Pattullo, Sophie Hey, and Rafik Dammak. We have received no apologies for today's call. From staff, we have Emily Barabas, Julie Hedlund; and myself, Nethalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Julf.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Nathalie, and Happy New Year, everybody, and greetings from a very medium gray Amsterdam. We have a fairly

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.

simple agenda ahead of us, so does anyone have any remarks to the agenda or can we proceed with the agenda that was sent by email?

I don't see anyone raising their hands, so I assume we are okay with this agenda. Anyone have any SOI updates? Ah, welcome, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Julf.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thanks. So, I don't hear anyone having any SOI updates. The only one I have myself is that I am now a board member of the Finnish chapter of the Internet Society [inaudible], for your information.

Okay. So, I guess we can actually move on to our real job, looking at the fellowship program mentor selection. I assume you all looked at the results. You also probably saw my email where I suggested we shall focus on the four candidates that actually got four [inaudible]. Do you agree with that or ...?

I see a yes from Carlton. I don't see any nos. And [yeah], everybody says it makes sense. Okay, so let's focus on those four.

Before we actually go and look at the scores themselves, do you have any comments on any of the candidates, also of any of the

results [inaudible] share with us? Oh, welcome, Philippe. No comments? This is going a bit too smoothly.

Okay. We do see the results that [inaudible] four came out pretty high, but there is a slight difference in the candidate's points. Of course this is a very rough [poll], so we shouldn't put too much weight to those results, but still, there is an indication here.

Yes. I agree with Jothan that we have very much a male-dominated list there, and it is of course a concern. I'm not quite sure what we should do about that, though. Any views or comments?

Okay, Jothan says he factored this into his voting, and I have to say, so did I. So, maybe that is kind of taken care of.

Okay. We do have to reach a consensus on one candidate here. I am [inaudible] made the first easy cut. Amr came out with top points. Does anyone have anything against appointing him?

Sophie has raised her hand, so Sophie, please go ahead.

SOPHIE HEY:

Yeah, hi. Sorry. This isn't opposing him but I did want to just feed in some of the feedback I received from the IPC about appointing a mentor and the general sense that I had—and this included feedback from a former fellowship participant—was that it's really quite difficult for those participants in the fellowship who are interested in a commercial aspect to not have any commercial engagement when they actually enter the fellowship program and I know from my own experience from the NextGen, there was a

very heavy focus on civil society. So, personally, my preference would be to look at Tom Barrett as well. So, thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. Jothan supports both Amr and Tom. I think we all seem to have fairly similar views, which still leaves a hard choice.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Julf, Rafik has his hand up.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Julf. So, hearing this comment about business, civil society, I'm kind of confused and concerned about [the point] because maybe we need to remind what we are trying to achieve here is to appoint [inaudible] from the GNSO side. So, it's not to represent a specific group [inaudible], that we think as a mentor can help [inaudible]. So, I think we need to focus on what kind of skills or experience that they can bring.

If we are to talk about business, I can then just remind that the previous or the last year mentor was from business. So, are we saying that we should, for example, appoint against someone from business? I don't think we should [inaudible] argument [inaudible] focus really and the skills or experience that the mentor will bring here. So, we did the polling and everyone could do the ranking

and add any comment they need or deem it helpful for making a decision.

So, this is kind of my perception. I'm not voting here but this is [inaudible] as someone to remind that the council does get the selection committee, so I guess it's important really to follow and to take into consideration what the requirement [inaudible]. So, yeah.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Rafik, and that's a very good point. Okay. [inaudible] rough consensus in the IETF sense of the word. Again, just [floating]. Sophie, would you actually be against appointing Amr? I understand you have a preference but how strong is that?

SOPHIE HEY: All right. Just quickly. I'm not against Amr at all. This was just a preference in what I've got from my constituency.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Fair enough, and I think we all understand the concerns, so thanks for bringing them up. Again, in the spirit of ICANN and IETF consensus, if you are not actually against it—again, I ask again, so is anyone actually against Amr or can we conclude that that could be a consensus based on our polls? I don't see any raised hands. Nobody is protesting very loudly. I don't see any tomatoes flying. I think I'm going to declare consensus. That went over smooth [inaudible] in the history of the standing committee, I think. Thank you, everybody.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Julf, Emily has her hand up.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Julf. This is Emily. You might be on mute. Is it okay if I speak for a moment?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, please. Go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks. This is Emily Barabas from staff. Just to give a little bit of context and background to how we've done things in the past for process, nearly for context, and again only as a suggestion—it's completely up to the group how you go forward.

For previous processes, if there wasn't a full attendance of the entire SSC on the call, we've as a group sort of often provided the opportunity on the mailing list for members to protest, provide any additional perspective on the preliminary decision before declaring it final. So, that's one possibility. If you'd like to do that, of course, certainly as the chair of the group, your decision about exactly how you move forward.

But one possibility is to say, based on the participation of the call, there was no opposition to putting Amr forward as the candidate. Please respond within three days or whatever if you have any concerns or opposition to this decision and give folks an opportunity to speak up if they weren't able to do so.

So, just wanted to provide that context and background and please feel free to decide for yourselves how you'd like to proceed. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Emily. You are so [much more] correct and fair than I am. I am a bit too focused on efficiency here. You are totally right and that's what we should do. We should [definitely] give the people who weren't on the call a chance to speak up if they have real major issues. But I think maybe two days would be enough. If somebody really has issues, they can speak up in that case. Yes, end of day Friday sounds good. Yeah. If we have end of day Friday as the deadline, I think we should have enough time if there's any issues to resolve them before the motion deadline. So, I think that will work.

Carlton, you have your hand up.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Question. Do we have a [quorate call]? Was there established a number of members would make the call quorate?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. That's actually a very good question, and Emily, I think you can answer it.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Julf. So, this is probably something that we should have staff gone over on our last call, just to talk a little bit about the

standard operating procedures for the SSC. So, unlike a lot of groups that you may be familiar with, the SSC operates by full consensus, which means that everyone has to agree or at least not disagree with the recommendation by the group. And it's up to the chair to determine when full consensus is reached.

So, in previous selection processes, this is generally meant that if there were no objections on a call, there were no objections on the email list through a follow-up, that was considered typically by the chair to be full consensus.

If there are strong objections, for example, on the mailing list, there is an opportunity just to talk a little bit about schedule which I guess jumps ahead a little bit on the agenda but is probably worth covering anyway.

While there's a document deadline on Monday, the SSC has the opportunity to—or I guess it would be Rafik probably putting in the motion—could put in a motion without any name actually put in there, and then the group could have another meeting if there was disagreement on the mailing list, let's say—not full consensus—the group could have another meeting next week to make a final recommendation, finalize the decision, and put in that name, add it to the motion prior to the council meeting.

So, there is a little bit of wiggle room there to reach full consensus if necessary, but I think that's been the standard process for reaching full consensus in the past or determining full consensus in the past. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you, Emily. Yes, I think we've all seen it happen fairly often, that we basically submit a motion but leave out things to be determined before we actually go to the actual meeting. So, we do have that extra buffer there, definitely.

Can we wait a little bit for Carlton to be plugged in again? But yeah, I think [inaudible] pretty much all happy with the [inaudible] we go to the email so everyone gets a chance to speak up if they really have an issue, and I think that's more than enough to determine consensus for these purposes.

Right. So, I guess that covers the next steps to complete selection process. We have a deadline on Friday for any possible comments and we deal with them if they show up.

Okay. Thank you. That's useful to have that draft timeline on the screen. I'm pretty much [inaudible] covers the whole point of this selection, unless anyone has something [to add] to this. I do see that Carlton still has his hand up but I assume that's an old one.

Marie, I think we need a meeting next week only if there is loud opposition on the email list.

So, moving on, we come to any other business. Does anyone have any other business they want to bring up?

I don't see anything, don't hear anything. Great. This has been a quite efficient one, which I don't think we mind. So, hereby I think I can end the meeting and thank everybody for a very, very efficient work. Thank you. And we'll hope that nothing shows up on the email list. Thank you very much and see you on the list.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, everyone, for joining today's call. This concludes it. You may now disconnect your lines and have a great rest of your day. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]