ICANN Transcription
GNSO Standing Selection Committee 19 April 2017 at 17:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ssc-19apr17-en.mp3
AC recording: https://participate.icann.org/p891o5tzgib/
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Attendees:
Poncelet Illelji,
Frederic Guilemaut,
Maxim Alzoba,
Julf Helsingius,
Osvaldo Novoa,
Hibah Kamal-Grayson (temporary alternate for Susan Kawaguchi)
Lori Schulman

Apologies:
Renate Ribeira Aquino

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Emily Barabas
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks very much Carla. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO's Standing Selection Committee Call on Wednesday, 19th of April 2017.

On the call today we have Poncelet Ileleji, Julf Helsingius, Osvaldo Novoa, Maxim Alzoba, Hibah Kamal Grayson and Frederic Guillemaut. We received

apology from Renata Aquino Ribeiro. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Emily Barabas and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your name so it appears clearly on the transcription. Thank you ever so much and over to you Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Nathalie. And thank you everyone for joining. As I noted before the call we almost have everyone onboard apart from Renata who sent apologies but who did provide input through the mailing list.

The only person that we currently do not have on is Lori Schulman from the IPC. We sent her a separate message so hopefully she will either be able to join. And speaking of the devil, I just see her logging in. So that means that we basically have everyone on the call apart from Renata indicated she wouldn't be able to join.

So I think basically where things currently stand is that we had a call on Monday in which we addressed some of the concerns that were expressed by some of you in relation to the original agreement or recommendations that were made resulting from a survey that the group undertook, you know, recognizing that it was a very short timeframe for the group in order to do that.

There was a desire to have a bit more balance in the number of candidates that would be recommended but at the same time recognizing that of course there are limitations with regards to the number of seat as outlined by the ICANN bylaws.

However, based on that conversation, there was agreement to try and move forward on the basis that instead of recommending three primary candidates, which the number as perceived by the ICANN bylaws, the SSC would actually recommend to the Council that it would advocate for four primary candidates as came out of the ranking and which would provide a more

balanced set of nominations looking at the different backgrounds and stakeholder groups and constituencies the different candidates hail from.

So basically that - on the basis of that, I modified the motion that was submitted by Julf to the Council, which you see up on the screen. And this one is actually the one that has incorporated the modification that Renata suggested that instead of listing the four primary candidates by alphabetical order to actually list them in ranked order, which is what you see here on the screen.

I see Maxim, could you send us the latest edits to the mail list, which we now see on Adobe. That is the email I sent earlier today in response to Renata. So you should have that in your inboxes in that line format.

So (is that) the only change that was made was instead in a resolved one; instead of having an alphabetical order, it now says ranked in order and has the four names listed there. There were also some questions that were raised. What would happen if the GNSO Council would not support this approach?

And at least my understanding was, and I'm happy to just stand corrected there that if Julf as the Council member in the group would put forward this proposal to the GNSO Council and basically make clear as well if this would not be supported by the GNSO Council that then he would request to withdraw the motion and instead request for additional time for the SSC to come to full consensus on the primary three candidates and the ranks for to seven candidates.

So that is basically the backup option should there be no support from the GNSO Council to go forward on this path. So I think that is where things currently stand.

As I noted, I think all of you expressed support for this approach apart from Lori who we haven't heard from and Lori I don't want to put you on the spot but it would be really helpful to hear from you whether this approach is something you are comfortable with.

As you all know, this group does operate on full consensus. So we do need everyone's support in moving forward. And I'm happy to know that Lori has just indicated in the chat that she is fine with this approach.

So I think on that note, we may actually have a very short call. So if everyone is comfortable with this approach, there are no further questions or comments, I think the next step would be for Julf to communicate to the GNSO Council submitting the revised version.

And Julf to facilitate that, you may want to submit the red line so people can clearly see the changes that have been made. And as far I understand, there hasn't been any seconder yet for the motion. So it's still fully within your remits to make these changes, as it's your motion at the moment. And hopefully you can then clarify in your email why these changes were made based on the working group - on the SSC deliberation.

And maybe also point out then should there not be support from the GSO Council for this motion or should the vote basically fail that then the - basically the ask of the SSC would be to have additional time to come back to the GNSO Council and to achieve full consensus on its proposed top three nominations as well as the four to seven.

And yes, Julf to your question in the chat, as soon as we finish this call, I'll send you the final red line version, which is basically what is reflected her on the screen.

So having said that, looking at the Adobe Connect room, I don't see any hands. Is there anything else people want to raise at this stage? The GNSO

Council meeting is on Thursday. Let me just check the exact time. I believe it's - let me just pull it up. I think it's 2100 UTC. That's correct, 2100 UTC.

So following the meeting we'll of course report back to you with the outcome of the meeting, which may either mean that you're done with this part of the work and we should start looking at the second assignment that you've already been given in relation to the selection of the GNSO representative to the empowered community or whether further time will need to be spent on this specific assignment in confirming or recommending nominations for the RBS Review Team.

Don't see any hands. I think I can give you what is 45 minutes of your time. And thank you all very much for joining on such short notice and providing your email on - your input on the email. And hopefully we'll have a - you'll have a successful vote on the GNSO Council meeting tomorrow already, which means that we can consider this assignment at least closed. So we'll keep you posted. Thank you again.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much everybody. This concludes today's conference. The recordings can be stopped and you may now disconnect your lines. Thank you.

END