EN

ICANN Transcription
Standing Selection Committee
Monday, 01 July 2024 at 18:00 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/CoDKF
The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
Page: https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Standing Selection Committee call on Monday, the 1st of July, 2020. We have no apology. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public Wiki shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn the call over to Karen day.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, Devan. Good afternoon, good morning, good evening, everyone. Thank you for taking time to come to this today. Just quickly, if anyone has any updates to their SOIs and you want to let us know about, now would be the time to raise your hand. Not seeing any updates needed. I will turn this meeting over to Julie to walk us through the poll results. Thank you.

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 HEDLUND: Thanks so much. Karen. First, I would like to go over the agenda to remind us of what we're doing today. Thanks everyone for joining for this very important selection process of the pilot holistic review nominees. And so the bulk of our time today will be spent on the evaluation and selection process. If we should need more time, we can schedule a meeting next Monday, but let's hope and try to get everything done and agreed to today so we can follow with a consensus call. But let's see how the meeting goes.

So just back to the agenda that you see in front of you. We're going to share the poll results. Sorry, we didn't share the poll results earlier, but we extended the poll until 17:00 UTC. And we needed to make some adjustments to the data so it will be easier to share and basically ran us out of time before this call. So share the results here during the call. And then we'll discuss the evaluation of the candidates, both based on the poll and for those who may not have taken the poll. We're very interested in your opinions and suggestions for how you would rank the candidates. So after the candidate poll results and the candidate evaluation, we'll move to developing suggested list of candidates. As a reminder, we can select seven candidates from the 19 candidates application. So we do need to bring the candidates and I'll switch to the Google Sheet shortly to help us with the ranking. And then assuming we come to agreement on a suggested list of candidates today, then we'll move on to the timing of a consensus call. And then a reminder that for agenda item three, we need to pick a time for the GAC liaison selection process meeting, which will be the 15th of July on Monday. And we're circling around to popular times based on previous polls. So we'll discuss that. And then down to any other business. Is there any other business that anyone would like to discuss?

Allright. Can I ask you to display the poll results, Saewon? Thank you. Jothan asked a question prior to this call began about the collection and development of the Google form for evaluation of candidates for the GAC liaison process. We'll be the owner of the collection of that data and we'll be using a SurveyMonkey poll, I think. I'm sorry, the applications will be in Word format though. So we should be able to more easily develop a spreadsheet and not be working off of a PDF. So I hope that's helpful. Thanks, Saewon, for displaying the data.

This is the ranking. We had six responses to the poll. Thank you for those of you who responded to the poll. Six responses is actually pretty good. Poll was not mandatory. Oh, and Saewon has put the poll results into the chat. If you'd prefer to look at them that way. So on the screen, the page you see now is the ranking. It's kind of small so I'm afraid it's a little hard for me to read. So we have Anil as number one, Caleb as number five. [There's responses] for James. Yeah, the SurveyMonkey graph is not all that helpful, and that's unfortunate. Julf has [inaudible] responses. Marie [has two.] Mark has three, and [inaudible] six. I'm seeing Jothan's question in the chat. Does it allow export of the data to share with the group? I think the only export options are PDF. I'm not sure though. Saewon, do you know?

SAEWON LEE: Yes. So the data file that I've shared with you, the file name data all 240701, that is the file that I've exported from the SurveyMonkey to share with you all. Does that answer your question, Jothan? Okay. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, I think it is just PDF as an option. Sorry about that. So, I'm looking at these results. And can you say a little bit more about the results here?

SAEWON LEE: Yes, Julie. Thank you. So the first thing that we would like to note, and again, as Julie mentioned, because the poll closed just an hour before this, and we were trying to interpret the rankings of how the graph shows. It was a bit less accurate of what the graph shows to what the actual results show to the individual candidates, as you can see in the data all file that I've just shared. But basically, we have to narrow it down to seven candidates. And as you can see, there were two threes and two sixes, making them seven.

So the first, as you can see, the ranking came to Anil Jain, the second to Marie Pattullo. Weirdly, the name hasn't been updated here. But as you know from last week's meeting, it should be Marie Pattullo. And then the third and fourth in Thai being Julf and Mark. Then we go up to fifth, Caleb, and sixth, James and a tie in six, making both six and seven James and Tony. So that's how the ranking showed from the six responses we received. Again, as I mentioned, as you can see in the graph, just if you see very, very accurately, James Gannon and Tony Holmes, the graph shows a bit of a gap. And so it didn't seem at first, this is how we read it. And then when we kind of went into individual results, the numbers show that they were exactly the same. So tying at six. And again, there might be a bit of a misread in other candidates as well. But I don't think it will really change the ranking. But I just wanted to point that out, that there's a bit of a gap in these graph showings. I hope that helps with the interpretation without going into each individual result.

JULIE HEDLUND: That's very helpful, Saewon. Thank you so much. I see there's an agreement in chat that the way you number things was quite helpful. Karen, please.

KAREN DAY: Thank you. Saewon, when you say that two candidates were exactly equal, are you basing that on just the yes votes, or are you basing that on all three criteria, they received the same yes votes, the same no votes, and the same I don't know votes? Or was there a priority, like they received the same yes votes. So, okay, well, then we go and we look at the no votes. And then we look at the I don't know votes. I mean, was there any wake to those results or were they all captured?

SAEWON LEE: Thank you for that question, Karen. So they were actually exactly the same. Luckily for us. So Tony and James, for example, were both exactly with six responses, both four yeses at 66.67%, both one, I don't know, at 16.67 and one noes. So they were exactly the same. Same for the Julf and Mark.

JULIE HEDLUND: Jothan?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yes, so this is six responses to the poll out of how many of us should have voted? So of our group, how many of us are here making the votes?

JULIE HEDLUND: I don't off the top of my head know the exact number. But the poll is not mandatory. So actually it's our discussion here that will help us come to the decision on the suggested nominees that we want to present to the council. And what will actually seal the deal, so to speak, is a consensus call that will follow this meeting. There will be a 48-hour consensus call, and this SSC has to come to a full consensus. So we have to agree on the full slate of seven nominees to present to the council. If we don't, if we're not able to do that, we go back to another meeting and discuss and hash out the selections again. But the poll was just one tool that we could use to make a decision. And mainly it's today's discussion that is the key to whether or not this group will be able to come to a decision on the suggested candidates. I'm just looking at the chat here.

SAEWON LEE: So sorry, I misspoke. The Tony and James were with the same results, but Julf or Mark. They actually do have different results with Julf showing four yeses with 66.67%, two nos with 33% and zero I don't knows. And Mark, two, two, two, all the same with 33.33% each. However, the result of 14%

average, I think that was the same for them both. So it's a bit of a different, let's say look on how Julf or Mark are tied and James and Tony are tied. But basically the end result is the same for both.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. I'm just noting. Thank you for comments, Bruna, in the chat. And I see a question from Remmy. As I mentioned at our last call, there was no requirement for the candidates to be evaluated based on the regions at ICANN. So I don't know to what extent people base their judgments on that. That is one piece of information. But I think it was suggested that this group should look first at the skills and the candidates and whether or not they have brought the skills and experience needed to the positions, and then the relevant other measures of diversity, such as gender and geographic region could come into play. So I can't say definitively whether or not we have a spread across the regions with this group. Do you want to go to the next results? Or is this the primary result? This is the primary result that we were going to present to the team, unless you would like to walk through each individual response.

JULIE HEDLUND: I don't think we need to do that. I think at this point, thank you, that's helpful. So I think at this point, I think we should open it up to discussion and see if people want to suggest, and I can switch to the Google Sheet, and we can talk about organizing a ranking of the candidates. Or we could have that. Yeah, go ahead, Karen, please.

KAREN DAY: I'm sorry, can we see Saewon's chart for another second, please?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Yeah, it might be simple to keep this up. What we should do at this point is discuss our suggested ranking of the candidates. If you want anything different than what we see here. So opening up for discussion.

KAREN DAY: I'll just jump in here and say the comment that I put in my comment section was that I did notice that Mark—and I don't know in other people's minds if, excuse me, this makes any difference. But I will note that Mark Datysgeld was our last SSC appointee on the last deployment that we were asked to make. So I don't know if people want to consider, you know, that in terms of allowing for different people to participate. Options other than appointing the same people over and over again, but I just thought I would, I would note that for your consideration.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Karen. Yes, that's an important point. Mark Datysgeld was the SSC's choice for mentor to the fellowship program, and he was confirmed by the council. That was back in, I think, January. So that is something that you may want to take into consideration. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS: Hello everyone. It's more like a question, not a comment on Mark, but a question on how do we evaluate the I don't knows, because I also noticed that some of the candidates might not have a no or might have less nos compared to others, but I think the I don't know bit, it's also a relevant kind of category, right, because it hints that some of us might have had some doubts or even didn't know really the person or the work, or, I mean, just had questions on whether the person would be fitting for the position. So perhaps a question, Not necessarily to you, Julie and Saewon, but for the group really on how do we evaluate the I don't knows.

JULIE HEDLUND: That's a good question. And yes, I don't think as staff we really have an answer to that. I mean, of course this evaluation is somewhat subjective. And candidates who may be known by members of the SSC are likely to rank higher than those who are not known, but then the applications should be taken at face value and if it's not possible to gauge by an application whether or not someone is qualified and ends up with a don't know, or a no, then that that's an important point. That's the evaluations made from the materials at hand. So it's hard to say that we could choose differently, more information, but I'd like to hear from other members of the SSC, as to how we can approach those people for whom there's not enough information to make it determination Karen please.

KAREN DAY: Yeah, just a comment. Others might have more things on this. The thing that struck me in terms of the rankings that came out here, which is my own rankings, which I did my own system. It seems that the geographic group, the group from which we got the most applications does not seem to be represented in these results. That was the African region. So, I'm wondering if we should do something differently to include some diversity. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: And I see Jothan was asking in the chat if positions are term limited. I don't know that they are. I suspect they're not because I think the pilot holistic review is meant to be a one-time process, so I think the candidates or the nominees are probably installed for the duration of the process. And the process extends for however long and probably not going to be long enough that there would be a need for term limits, if that makes sense. And yes, Karen saying it's more akin to a PDP working group than an office. Yes, exactly. For the duration of the project. Thank you. More comments. Jothan please.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yes, thank you. So as I review these, and I don't have the privilege of knowing everyone on this list, I do notice that we've got seven candidates identified. I also notice, as I look across those through the lens of some of the other things we will think about coming up, such as regional or other metrics or [inaudible] that scrapes seven off of the list, and those are [inaudible] respective of all of the different sort of attributes we might be looking at. And I wanted to maybe suggest that to the group. Can you hear me okay?

JULIE HEDLUND: I think you're breaking up a little bit for me but I think I got the gist. Anybody else have any trouble? Not hearing any comments. Any suggestions? Yeah, [we top 10 this.] And someone else said you were breaking up for them. Karen please.

KAREN DAY: Yes, from what I see in the chat, and what I did get of Jothan's speech, he's suggesting that we take a first step by doing the top ten, and then going from there, even though we only get seven seats—I will say that that, as I also noted in my comments and my survey, that was what I did, I did the top 12. I felt like any of the top 12 would be fine candidates to participate in this work. And then I looked at the top 12 that I had personally liked and then just shuffled one or two based on other criteria beyond what was printed on the paper. So, region, participation in recent projects and things like that. So I'd be fine with starting at—if we can all agree to look at the top 10. And then go from there.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Karen. Thank you, Jothan. Segunfunmi.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Yes, good day everyone. We've gone really well, and I commend the team for putting this together. But I also strongly believe that we need to put diversity into consideration, as much as there's no formal examination, if all we did was just to rank them based on the experience and the same question they were all answered, I strongly believe that no certain region should be left out unconsidered. That's my honest opinion.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much. I have a comment that we're having trouble hearing some people. So, we can start by picking a top 10. Recognizing that we do have to come up with seven. So, if we go to seven from 10, that's fine, but we can't present 10 to the council. The decision has to rest with us. So we have to present seven candidates in the end, one way or another. Jothan, since you mentioned it, do you want to suggest your top 10? Yes, thank you. Jothan says, "My suggestion about top 10 gives us a narrow [inaudible] diversity lens." Thank you, very helpful. I see a hand up for Remmy.

REMMY NWEKE: I think the top 10 idea is good. I don't know whether we should still just mark it up based on the outcome of the poll. Just like Jothan was also mentioning on the chart. Since we have the other three tops, we can just add them to the list we already have. [inaudible]suggesting top 12. Top 10 is fine by me.

JULIE HEDLUND: Please go ahead.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Yes, while I, from the charts we currently have, if we do top 12, right, or top 10, and we still need to narrow down to seven. I believe that from this chart, there's no way the regions that

were not included will still be considered. So my approach initially when I was doing my ranking, just to share a thought with you guys, was since we have candidates from five regions, right, what I did was to rank each persons per region. So from each of the five regions, I got top one from each region, or top two from each region. And from then I was able to have my first top five covering five regions, which include diversity. Then from the other ranking, I was able to get two other persons to make up seven. I don't know what you think about that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Karen suggesting the chat. Tony, Anil, [inaudible] Caleb, Emmanuel, [inaudible] Sophie, [inaudible] James and Julf. Who did you suggest, Segunfunmi? If you want to add it in the chat. And others, please feel free to add your suggestions in the chat. Yeah, Jothan's note says 10. Four from Africa, Karen says. Four from Europe, one from North America, and one from Asia Pacific. Anyone else want to suggest in chat, 10 or 12 or otherwise? And Karen knows that she dropped Mark Datysgeld because he was our last appointee. Good point. Does anyone else want to suggest candidates in the chat or speak up? We have roughly 23 more minutes. And we do want to try to come to a decision today. Does anyone disagree with Karen's list in the chat? Jothan says, "So I suggest with our seven [inaudible] Sophie, Hector and Benjamin." Bruna says, "Anil, Caleb, James, Julf, Marie, Sophie, Pedro, Tony." Not a top 10. Thanks, Bruna. Anyone else? I see some correspondences there.

So far, we have a list from Karen and a list from Bruna. And we have a list from Jothan. Seven plus Sophie, Hector and Benjamin. Anyone else? Here's Segunfunmi. Anil, Marie, Caleb, Mark, Benjamin, Julf and Tony. Let me ask if people agree that we should drop Mark because he's already been selected as the fellowship mentor. That's why Benjamin did not end up in the top three. All right, well, there certainly is some agreement on some of the candidates. Anyone else want to make suggestions? This is our opportunity to make our evaluation. Whether or not you took the poll. I'm just looking. Remmy, did you have suggestions?

KAREN DAY: I was going to ask, are you counting the tick marks as people are putting names in here? I was trying to and then I got lost.

SAEWON LEE: I'm gathering what's being shared in the chat. Yes. If it does help, I can kind of try to gather the common names and present it to you if possible, if that is the best way to go about this.

KAREN DAY: That, or we could say that the survey results count as one vote for a candidate. There's just a myriad way to do this. You're the professional, you tell us.

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry. I'm not sure I quite caught that, Karen. Are you suggesting we hold the poll during this meeting?

KAREN DAY: No, I was saying that if we say, okay, everybody in in the seven that Julie and Saewon's chart, they already get one vote. And then we just go down and put checkmark beside them from each one of us in a spreadsheet. See who then ends up with the most, if that leads us to a top seven. Because I think you're looking at the names that I'm seeing come across in the chat. I do see some synergies.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, why don't I bring up the Google Sheet as Jothan suggests and see if that will help us to finalize our candidates.

KAREN DAY: Do you want to first highlight the poll results, candidates, or give them one point each?

JULIE HEDLUND: One point each. Okay, yeah, please go ahead.

KAREN DAY: So I have Tony.

JULIE HEDLUND: I noticed Remmy's question in the chat, trying to avoid another round of voting. Although we can produce a poll with reduced list of candidates and run another poll and then meet again next Monday. By the way, we can submit the motion and motion deadline is next Monday. But we can submit the motion without the names. So conceivably, if we don't have agreement by next Monday, we could still submit the motion for the meeting. The deadline of the 8th, the meeting on the 18th. And we have to follow with a consensus call. And we would have to reach consensus before the meeting on the 18th.

SAEWON LEE: I'm putting in the ranking on the side.

JULIE HEDLUND: Column H are the ranks?

SAEWON LEE: This is not the ranks. This is the points that I've added so far.

KAREN DAY: These are points that you're getting from the chat.

SAEWON LEE: Yes. Excluding the ranking of the graph. Obviously.

JULIE HEDLUND: This is extremely helpful, Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you for suggesting, Karen. I didn't know we would be doing this today, so I'm sorry that I wasn't following up on this.

KAREN DAY: None of us did.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, this is a fairly complicated selection process than what we're used to. So we're kind of making it up as we go along. But thank you for your very helpful suggestion, Karen.

SAEWON LEE: So the inputs that I'm putting on the side seems to be the rank.

JULIE HEDLUND: When you say on the side, I see numbers in column H and numbers in column I.

SAEWON LEE: Right. So column H is the poll or the number of ticks and the poll I is the poll ranking so far.

KAREN DAY: So we see we have four candidates that we seem to all agree on.

SAEWON LEE: Yes, Anil, everyone's agreeing on, and Tony as well. They have five votes, both leading. And then Caleb and Sophie have four votes that are in second and third place. So let's say tying second. And then you see Emmanuel and Marie that have three votes so far. That seems to be in the lead. I'm trying to see more commonalities. Right now, I can't seem to catch more than that.

KAREN DAY: Jothan is saying we're missing a vote for Benjamin on the top row.

SAEWON LEE: So I see three Benjamins.

KAREN DAY: Saewon, I think Jothan is trying to tell us that he calls Benjamin … I can't pronounce the way it is [inaudible]. Sorry. Benjamin is top row. Jothan's calling him by his last name. For what we presumed to be his last name.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you for that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Jothan's noting that Benjamin [inaudible]. Thank you.

KAREN DAY: So we have four that have five and four. We have three that have three. So that's seven right there. Who in this seven that we have is not in the poll? Who is in the poll? Like if you could.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you. Sorry to cut you off, Karen. So currently, there's Anil Jain, that's the same as the poll. He's number one. Tony, whereas here, he's number two, he is in the poll, but number six. And then we go on to Caleb, who is number two here. Again, he's in the poll, but not number two, he's number five. And then there's Sophie Hey, who is number two here, but not in the poll. Then we go on to Benjamin, who is number three here, but not in the poll again. Emmanuel, who's number three here, again, not in the poll. Marie is number three here, and is number two in the poll. And then the fourth being [inaudible]. He's not in the poll. So the people that we are missing here, or maybe I might have missed. Yes, I have missed. So James Gannon, he actually had a higher poll that I had missed. Sorry.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, Bruna is saying that James and Julf [are all in the poll.]

SAEWON LEE: Yeah. So James Gannon is in the poll. And he just earned four ticks. So he's actually also number two. And Julf, yes, thank you. So Julf got five votes here. So he, I also missed. Actually, that's already, I think, 10 for [inaudible]. So let me do that in order.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think we're not doing column J. Karen is asking.

KAREN DAY: Okay.

JULIE HEDLUND: Looks like, yeah, 10 candidates. We have five minutes left on this call. It seems that we're not going to maybe distill these down, seven candidates today. Should we create a quick poll for people to take the candidates and revisit this next Monday? And Segunfunmi is asking about Mark. We were leaving off Mark because we've already selected him as the mentor for the fellowship program. But you were speaking, Karen, sorry.

KAREN DAY: I thought that's what we had all agreed earlier. I thought that was the earlier consensus. If we have 10 candidates, can we run a poll over the list?

JULIE HEDLUND: Seems there's general agreement to leave him off. staff could take the direction to make a simple poll just with these candidates to be ranked.

KAREN DAY: Are there any that we want to …?

JULIE HEDLUND: [inaudible].

KAREN DAY: [inaudible]

JULIE HEDLUND: Jothan is saying add Hector to have Latin American [inaudible]. Making things complicated, Jothan. So that would be helpful, Saewon. Let's start off with what.

KAREN DAY: So I'm questioning … Jothan here, [would Mark have qualified if he wasn't disqualified?]

JULIE HEDLUND: So, yes, Pedro got votes too. So we should pick up Pedro. That would also be Latin—If we pick up Hector and Peter, then we'll back to 12. Yes, and Jonathan says that they got the highest Latin American ranking. Okay, let's take the action. We've got two minutes left here. Go ahead, Karen.

KAREN DAY: Yeah. So here's my question to the group now based on what people have asked, we're going to add people back in. Are we going to run this poll so that we come out with all five regions represented so that we would have to have a Latin American candidate, in which case we would vote amongst the regions rather than amongst the whole? Is that what you're going for, Jothan?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah. One Latin American. Keep in mind that we just have seven candidates to select. And we want to make sure that we have candidates who are qualified. So we may not have a geographic distribution for our final choices. We can try to get this spreadsheet into some order to help us with ranking. But we'll probably have to create another poll or have people use the Google Sheet to apply a ranking one way or another. We'll need to make a decision by next Monday. In the meantime, we can either do a doodle poll or we can ask if people can meet at the same time next Monday so we can avoid a poll. And we can go ahead and schedule a call for next Monday. Noting it is now the top of the hour. Karen says the same time. Can anyone not do 18:00 UTC next week? All right, we'll set a meeting Monday the 8th for 18:00 UTC. In the meantime, we'll organize this Google Sheet and get something out and possibly also send a poll. But let's start with the Google Sheet and see if we can suggest … We can't really do the GAC candidate next week, Saewon, because we won't have the candidates yet. The deadline for the candidates is the 8th. So we'll be meeting on the 15th. And let's go with 18:00 UTC for that day too. All right, it's one minute after the call. So thank you all for joining. Thanks so much for chairing, Karen. And thank you for all your help, Saewon, and getting us in order here. And we'll talk again next week. Thank you all. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]