
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Standing Selection Committee

Wednesday, 24 January 2024 at 20:00 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/GYCNEQ>

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 Wednesday, the 24th of January, 2024. For today's call, we have apologies from Arinola Akinyemi, Glen de Saint Géry, Brian Winterfeldt, and Q Misell. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. And with that, I will turn it over to Julie Hedlund. Thanks, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Julie B. And I apologize if I missed it. Did you note the apology from Arsene?

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.

JULIE BISLAND: I did not. I will do that now. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: He also had to recuse himself as one of the candidates. So, great, thanks. So welcome, everyone. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Our normal chair is Arinola. And she was unable to chair today because she has recused herself as being one of the candidates for the GNSO-Nominated mentor to the Fellowship Program. So you are stuck with staff to administer this meeting. Staff is not chairing this meeting, but we did not have any volunteers to chair. So staff is simply running the meeting as an administrator only, not as a chair. Unless there are any objections, we'll proceed like that. Or unless there are any volunteers to take over as chair right now, we'll proceed in an administrative role. I see Ann says, "Thanks, Julie. Go for it." Thanks, Ann. Appreciate that.

So the primary work today is the selection process for the GNSO-Nominated Fellowship Program mentor. And we'll start by reviewing the poll results. We don't have many responses to the poll, but the poll is also not mandatory. It's simply to provide us some guidance, excuse me, I'm a little hoarse today, to provide us with some guidance as we discuss the candidates. We had 12 candidates received according to the deadline. And I hope you have all reviewed the candidate information.

We've sent you that link on several occasions. So after we review the poll results, we'll discuss the candidates. Hopefully, we'll call

us around a choice. And then that person's name will go out for a 48-hour consensus call. So starting at 21:00 UTC today and ending at 21:00 UTC on Friday, if there are no objections to the name we put forward, we will notify the Fellowship Program by the 31st of January and note that that name is subject to confirmation by the GNSO council.

The name will go on the agenda, the consent agenda, for the GNSO council meetings on 15th of February. So a motion will be submitted by the 5th of February. And then Any Other Business we added was an update on the SSC membership refresh. There's a yearly refresh of the membership and all of your SG and Cs have been notified and we're awaiting responses from some. We've received responses from others. So that process is underway. Are there any questions about the agenda or anything anyone wants to add to the agenda?

Seeing no hands, I'm going to go ahead and stop sharing this screen and go on to one of two documents that we have as results from the survey. So just a moment while I change screens. I'm not very speedy. One moment. I think you can all see this. And let me just make sure I can see our participants in chat. So the poll was very simple. First part of the poll simply asked a question as to whether or not the candidates had, excuse me, let me just move the screen up to show this a little bit better. One moment. It's not displaying the way it looks. So the candidates, in the poll, let me just pull up the question, sorry, there. The question was, I don't know why the question is not showing up.

So anyway, the question was whether or not the person, the people had provided the information needed in the expression of

interest. The options were yes, no, or don't know. And so for each of these, we see primarily yes and don't know. For the first person, that's Adetola, no, and some yes. And you can see the percentage of responses here. I'm just going to go relatively quickly through this. For Semlani, Arsène, all yes, for Mark, all yes. Mubashir. Sorry, my scrolling is a little foggy. And that's here. Primarily yes, some don't know.

And I know Anna had asked this question while we're going through these on the list about whether or not an SOI or statement of interest was a requirement. It's not specifically a requirement, although if a candidate has been participating in ICANN structures, generally one would expect, thank you Semlani for putting the question in the chat, generally you would expect that the candidate would have an SOI. I know in some cases they did not. So the question that was asked was based on the candidate's material and your own personal experience is applicable. Do you think the candidate has the experience, skills, and attributes necessary as described in the call for volunteers to serve as a GNSO-nominated mentor?

That's all the candidates for that question. Does anybody need me to go back to any of the candidates or responses? Or does anybody have any questions concerning this part of the poll? I'm not seeing any hands. Then we'll move on to the next document. And the question associated with this next document is to please rank the following candidates in order of preference with regards to how the candidate meets the experience, skills, attributes, requirements outlined in the call for volunteers. One would be first order of preference, two next order of preference, et cetera. And

thank you for saying that to me. I'll bring up the document with the rankings. One moment. Can everybody see that?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes, and my question was just the one, two, and three, does that indicate the highest rank, next rank, and third rank?

JULIE HEDLUND: That's correct, yes.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks. What we tried to do is looking at the rankings received from the responses to determine if we could isolate the top three candidates. And as Saewon is noting, we were able to do so based on the four responses received. It was Mark, Adetola, and Arsène. Let me just pull it down so you can see the full, it's a little big, so let me make it so that the whole list shows up on the page. Let me see again. Again, it's a little fussy. There we are.

Now the names are practically impossible to read. So we had Marcus came in top ranked, Arsène third, and Adetola second. Let me pause there and see if there are any questions. Otherwise, we'll move off of the poll and move to discussion. I'm not seeing any hands up. So let's go ahead and move to a discussion. I'll leave this page up, if it's helpful. And let me open things up for discussion. Thanks. Karen, please.

KAREN DAY: Hi. This is Karen Day for the Record Registry Stakeholder Group, and what I did was I went through and scored each of the applicants based on the seven criteria outlined on a scale of zero to three. And my scoring mark came out above everybody else by two points. I agree with the polling there. Mark was the most preferred candidate. I also, the second, I had a group of three individuals who on the scoring grouped as the same score two points lower than Mark for second place.

But moving away from the math, from the subjective and more from the facts, more to the subjective, I had ranked Adetola as the preferred of those three in that group. So he was definitely my second choice. And then everybody else just seemed to sort of fall away after that. So in my view, we've got two really good candidates here, and either one of them would be a terrific asset to the program. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks very much, Karen. That's extremely helpful. Appreciate you sharing that. Further thoughts? Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks very much. This is Anne for the record. And I thought we had several good candidates. Technically speaking, I actually only ranked five of them other than the fact that I did put the two that didn't have an SOI at the bottom of my ranking, because I do feel as though if you understand the ICANN system, you really you understand that you need to have an SOI. And the importance of that for the mentor also to be able to mentor the

fellows in connection with SOI and transparency is very important. But several good top candidates. I know that on the standing selection committee, we operate on full consensus. And so certainly based on the ranking that we're seeing I would support Mark's candidacy. I note that at least he has geographic diversity. I know diversity is one of our goals. I think that Mark is I'm not sure where in South America exactly. I should know that.

But I think that that aspect of diversity would be met by choosing Mark. So and I don't know. We're not choosing any sort of alternate or anything like that. So that's really about all I was going to say, because I know we need full consensus.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Anne. That's very helpful. Yes. And just to confirm the SSC operates under full consensus. That means there need to be no objections to the choice of the candidate. And in this instance, at least for this process, there's no option to select to select an alternate, just a single candidate. And thank you for your comments about the SOI as well. That's very helpful. Anyone have other thoughts? Please don't be shy about speaking up. I see Christian is saying in the chat, full support for Anne's comments and for Mark. Thank you, Christian.

We are, of course, still in the middle of the process. We are still in the middle of the process. We are still in the middle of the process. We are of course, going to go into a consensus call, so we will make sure that all SSC members, except for those who are accused, will have the option to voice if they have any objections. But it seems

to me that I'm hearing that there's support for Mark Datysgeld as the SSC selection for the GNSO nominated mentor to the Fellowship Program. And so the next step would be for Sagan, thank you so much for confirming that, that Mark comes at the top of your ranking also, and Karen also plus one for Mark. Thank you. Very helpful.

The next step would be for staff to open up a consensus call for 48 hours with Mark Datysgeld as the candidate asking for any objections that would go to 21:00 UTC on Friday. And if there were no objections, then that choice we put forward to the Fellowship Program and then also included in a motion for the GNSO Council to consider at its 15 February meeting. If we have any objections, then we will have to schedule an SSC meeting to include those people who might object or we can try to resolve on the list if there are any concerns. I have to note that in my few years of supporting the SSC, we've not had any objectives, objections to a candidate. So let's hope that that will again be the case. Are there any further comments or questions? About this process and about this selection today, Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you, Julie. And this is more of an AOB question, but I came on the Standing Selection Committee as a NomCom representative and I don't know what has to be followed there in terms of reappointment. I'm certainly willing to serve during this next year. I don't know whether Paul or Desiree would feel strongly either way about it, and I'm not sure what procedure has to be followed with respect to the NomCom participation.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Anne. You actually anticipated the next item on our agenda. We went ahead and added an AOB on the SSC membership. And I'm going to switch over to the membership page right now. So your question is very apropos. I hope you can all see the membership page. Let me know if you're seeing something else. I never know if this switches the way it's supposed to. Let me see this chat. Let me see. Yes. Thank you. So here are our lists of members.

So Anne, we have you down as eligible and need to reconfirm, but that's a good question about because you're the NomCom. I think it's simply a matter for the council to confirm if you wish to continue on the SSC. There will be a motion relating to membership also at the 15 February meeting first to confirm once we have the members from each of the groups, we need to confirm who will be the chair and the vice chair, assuming we have volunteers. And then we also need to, I think, confirm the NomCom. But I see Karen's hand is up. Please go ahead, Karen.

KAREN DAY: Hi, Julie. This is Karen Day for the record. I'm not seeing my name up here and I know that I'm a fill-in because one, our member resigned. Does that mean that I should not participate in the consensus call?

JULIE HEDLUND: That's a really good question. I know you're on membership and so I'm not sure.

JULIE BISLAND: Julie, can you scroll your screen down just a little bit?

JULIE HEDLUND: Maybe that's, well. She's above Q Misell. Oh, really? Let me, hold on. Oh, yes. There we are. That's okay. It's my screen handling. Oh, leaves a little to be desired. And I've got some things blocking my screen, so let me just get these things out of the way. Anyway, so back to your question and I see you're confirmed, Karen. I'll check again what we did in the past, but I'm pretty sure that it's a council confirmation in the consent agenda to confirm your standing as an NomCom representative on the SSC. I don't know why my screen stopped sharing. Very odd.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Julie. So that would be an agenda item for the next meeting, as you say. Obviously, if Paul or Desiree feel strongly about wanting to rotate that. I think Paul was the SSC member before I came on to council. He has a lot on his plate, but so does Desiree, so it's just whatever they want to do. I can continue, and that's fine. So I'm not sure if we just want to put that whole slate forward. I could also initiate an email to Paul and Desiree and copy you and ask them about it. Would that be a good idea or should you initiate that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Why don't I go ahead and initiate that? I don't know that there's any -- I know there's no procedure associated with that, but I'll check to make sure before I do so.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Just let them know that I have volunteered to continue, but if either one of them feels strongly then I would step aside. So thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: I will be happy to do so. Thanks, Anne, and thanks for your question. That was very helpful. So anyway, we're in the process of confirming those who need to be confirmed and are getting replacements for those who need to be replaced from the different SG's and C's. And I know we did get a response from IBC that they needed a little more time. We've given them until the end of this week.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: They asked me about that, by the way. And I said, guys, I'm NomCom, I'm an IBC member, but I am not an IBC appointee. And I think they have a couple other ideas. So I'm assuming that I think they'll be getting back to you soon. Laurie. I was asked if I would continue, and I said, well, I plan to continue, but I'm not IBC, I'm NomCom. So anyway.

JULIE HEDLUND: That's funny. Laurie seemed to suggest they, I think, had some interest. So that's a good sign. So we just have some

replacements that we need to get, registrar. We know IBC is coming. NCSG. And I think Greg DiBiase is going to see if one of his vice chairs wants to step in as ex officio. Which should be fine. So that's where we stand right now. So we'll keep following up with these groups and we'll make sure that there's a placeholder motion on the 5th for the 15th of February meeting to confirm the membership.

And as we get members in, well, prior to that meeting, we'll also ask if there are volunteers for chair and vice chair. And that's for the SSC to select its chair, vice chair, and they can do so. It can do so and just needs to be an item on the consent agenda again to just be confirmed by the council. Are there any questions about membership? I'm not seeing any hands. Is there any other business? Any further other business? Thank you, Segunfunmi. Please go ahead.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Yes. My name is Segunfunmi Olajide for the record and just a few observations when I was trying to select a candidate. I don't know. Confirm if it's for me to share my screen for a moment.

JULIE HEDLUND: I don't think I have the ability to have you do that. To share your screen. Can you talk through?

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: I have few observations that I listed out, which I want to recommend and then secure I believe that those processes of

selection will be easier if we actually check the selection criteria once again. For instance, two of the candidates do not have SOI, which I ran to lower before decision deciding. I think one of them is we need to make a statement of interest as compulsory or mandatory. Secondly, I also noticed that some candidates were not alumni of the fellowship. I think it would be appropriate to ensure that people who are coming as mentors for fellowship should be alumni of the fellowship. So that's two.

The third one is I also think I also suggest that I noticed one of the candidates has not even spent up to five years within the ICANN community and is contesting for fellowship mentor. I think there should be a minimum of five years active participation within the ICANN community for someone to be a mentor.

Then lastly, I'm also suggesting that if you check the candidate, some particular stakeholder group has more than one or two candidates, will it be possible to have a consensus candidate from each of the stakeholder groups before coming on board? I think with that, it will be easier to make selections of candidates and streamline to one eventually.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you. Those are very helpful suggestions. And we're taking notes. So we'll certainly report that. And we can take it as an order of business if the SSC members agree to review the process for the selection of the mentor and the criteria. But I see Anne has her hand up. Please go ahead, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: That's a very interesting topic. We could probably devote a whole other meeting to it just for that type of review being suggested. I agree in relation to the SOI. Not sure I agree. I think I agree with respect to the five years. Not sure at all that I agree with respect to being an alum of the Fellowship Program because there are plenty of folks within the community with a tremendous amount of experience and able to mentor people on the organization and how it works and how to get involved in working groups and all of that that may never have been fellows. I know many that would fit the bill for that. And I'm not seeking to do that myself at all. It's not a personal interest. But I don't think being an alum of the fellowship should be a program should be a requirement.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Anne. That's very helpful. I think we should, after we share the notes from this call, we could see whether or not we have an agreement from SSC members to set this up as a standalone discussion for our call at the SSC to review the process for the criteria for the mentor. So we'll see if there's interest in doing so. It seems that we have some food for thought.

And I just want to clarify. If someone wants to be, I should have been more specific when talking about the chair and the vice chair positions. So the SSC selects its chair and vice chair. And we do that based on once we have our membership reconstituted, we'll ask if there are volunteers for chair and vice chair. And the SSC can make a choice if there are volunteers. Hopefully there will be. Erin is our current chair, but she's going to have to step down from that position because she served two terms. And the limit is two terms.

And the vice chair is Alan and he has stepped down from his position. And I don't think it's going to be back on the SSC. So we'll need a chair and a vice chair. So once we have our membership reconstituted, we'll take up, we'll send, run a call for volunteers and then do a non-aggression process among the SSC members. And then the council piece of that is just a confirmation on the consent agenda of the chair and the vice chair. Not really a decision per se. I hope that's helpful.

Is there anything else anybody wants to discuss? Looking for hands looking in the chat. Otherwise, we can schedule a meeting. Well, let's wait and get our membership reconstituted first. And then we can do a doodle for a meeting. And once we have the new membership settled and we can perhaps then also run the call for chair and vice chair on the list.

Once we do all that and if there's interest in reviewing the membership criteria, we can do that as our next call. I'm not aware of any other selection processes coming up in the near future. But that's a piece of work we could maybe undertake as a next call. But thanks for that question, Saewon.

Any other questions? Anne says thanks, Julie, Julie, Saewon and all. Yes, thank you all for joining. Thank you for your diligence and thoughtfulness in the selection process. You'll see a call for consensus shortly on the list. Thanks so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]