
ICANN Transcription

Standing Selection Committee

Monday, 08 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/RgASFQ>

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

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Monday, the 8th of July, 2024. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted to the public wiki space 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 multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. And with that, I will turn it back over to you, Karen. Thank you.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Julie. Good afternoon. Good day, everyone. Whatever time zone you may be in, welcome. I'm glad to see we've got some different faces on the call today. So we will continue to add to our variety of inputs in this process. I am going to go ahead and not delay us anymore and turn this over to Saewon, our policy cohort here today to walk us through where we are with our latest tool assessment of the candidates. And just as a reminder, we are looking for a slate of seven candidates to represent the GNSO in this process. Thank you, Saewon.

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.

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Karen. So same as last time, same as last week's meeting, we went through the SurveyMonkey tool again to gather rankings of the 19 candidates that this standing selection committee has to nominate for the pilot holistic review. And unfortunately, though we kind of provided an extension for the tool, we only received three responses. And the screen that you're seeing now is a summary of the three responses we received.

So first of all, in the small numbers or the small characters that you can see, that's the weighted average that the SurveyMonkey tool generated for this nomination. And the big red numbers are what you can see as what I have added in as the rankings in order until number seven or the seventh place that we have to nominate during this selection.

So I won't go into each detail in the sense that it's the same as last week or what I presented last week. But in the order of the weighted average and what the bar graphs shows, in first place in tie was Anil Jain and Sophie Hey. Third place was Tony Holmes. Fourth place was Akinmoyeje Benjamin. Fifth, Julf Helsingius, and sixth, Caleb Ogundele. As you can see, their weighted average is the same. It does generate 15. But when you go into the detailed responses or the detailed rankings, Julf shows a little bit of a lead, as you can also see from the bar graph. And that's why he was fifth place and Caleb sixth. And then last but not least, seventh place was Marie Pattullo.

I will share the data, the summary data, as well as the responses in the chat now for you. But this is basically the summary of what we received during the SurveyMonkey tool and all I have prepared for you for now. And I think I can hand it over to Karen.

KAREN DAY:

Yes, thank you, Saewon. Appreciate that. I'm going to turn now to Julie H. to lead us through a discussion on consensus and what we need to do to get there. And we'll start with looking at this ranking that Saewon has presented of the top seven candidates in the latest survey tool. Julie, please.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Karen. Thanks, Saewon. So this group operates by full consensus and the decision making process for selections is made during these meetings. The

SurveyMonkey tool is just a tool to gather some responses, but not meant to be mandatory or definitive. Yes, Mike, noted, we did only get three responses. And so what we'll do is see if we can come to a decision on this call as to the seven nominees for the GNSO to the pilot holistic review and then go to a 48 hour consensus call on the list so that everyone can participate and indicate whether they have objections to the nominees, which we hope we have agreement on this meeting. If we have an agreement on this meeting to seven nominees, we'll put that to the list for a consensus call. And then a placeholder motion will be submitted today to the council so that it can be on the consent agenda and the names of the nominees will be added to the amended motion once they're agreed to by the SSC.

So notwithstanding the fact that we had three responses to the tool, we need to note that the decision needs to be made for seven nominees for the GNSO, otherwise the GNSO will not have any representation on the pilot holistic review team and that's not an acceptable outcome. So we're hoping that we can come to an agreement here in this meeting.

And so what we'd ask is that you speak up now on this call for those who are attending and indicate whether or not you agree with the choices put forward here in the SurveyMonkey tool or if you would like to see a different list of seven nominees. And we can discuss this here. And let's just try to get everyone to speak up, please, because this is your opportunity. And we'll make sure that people also have opportunity to speak on the list if they have a different selection. Jothan, I see your hand is up.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Yeah, hi, Julie. And I hope you had a really good holiday. So in looking at this, I support these seven people. I think actually it ended up I had picked all of these people. So, you know, and clearly others have. I think we have to just perhaps one more time look through this from the diversity lens. Are we making sure that representation is geographically, etc., balanced as we put forth these candidates?

I'm noting we can do everything we can to engage more people to participate in this process and be inclusive about that, the choices. But how do we make sure that as we

put this forward, that everybody is happy with this outcome, or at least we have heard the voices that need to state something about this? Thank you.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Jothan. And I'm sure I am going to echo what Julie said earlier, which is the way that we will ensure that everybody that wants to speak has spoken as we will put this out for a consensus call. That is how this group operates, and consensus is by non-objection. So, every stakeholder group, every representative will have had the chance for input.

As to your diversity question, I believe that if we were to look at the representation in the top seven here on this, we would see that we have North America, Africa, Europe, and AP represented. I believe LAC is the one that did not have a representative make it into the top seven. So, that is just an added data point for you, Jothan, to judge on the diversity. It looks like it is pretty good.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Karen.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

Yeah, and thank you, Karen. That really does address what I was looking at there. So, thank you for noting that.

JULIE HEDLUND:

There was a question in the chat from Mike about how this ranking differed from the results that we had last week. I'll try to address that, but I'll ask Saewon to chime in, and Karen, of course, too. This is a little more diverse, I think, group than we ended up with the ranking last week. We also had a couple of candidates, I think, rank lower this time than last time. I think that's largely the same or similar group, but Karen, please go ahead.

KAREN DAY:

Thanks, Julie. I will note for Mike and anyone else who wasn't on the call last week and hasn't had a chance to listen to it, the initial tool that came in, and my recollection is, again, simply my memory, which is known to be faulty at the best of times, was that the first tool, the first input we had wasn't very diverse. But as we progressed through the conversation on the last call, we talked about diversity, and I will say that, in my opinion, that was the one thing that we, everyone on the call, agreed on, was with this largest slate, with being able to put forward seven names, even though it is not required by council that we factor in diversity, that diversity was something that we wanted to factor in. By the end of that call, the slate that we had sort of winnowed down to the top 13 that I alluded to in my earlier email was a more diverse slate, and I will say that those who participated in using the tool this past time seemed to have taken that conversation to heart. So that's the one thing that I would say that has changed between the very first time we used the tool and where we are today, is that it's a much more diverse panel.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Karen, that's very helpful. So I'd like to hear from people that we haven't heard from yet as to whether or not this list of candidates is successful or if people have other suggestions. So we've heard from Christian, we've heard from Jothan, Mike, do you have any thoughts you'd like to share?

MIKE RODENBAUGH:

Yes, sorry, the internet connection is bouncing up and down today, so I've only heard part of this. Well, I would ask, I suppose, but I would like to see somebody from Latin America, and I'd like to see somebody from the IPC, so I was hoping that Hector Ariel Manoff would be selected to the team. It seems like we have maybe some over-representation from Africa and from NCUC as it looks, but I'm not really sure without going back and looking at the specific names and who they were because I just don't remember a couple of these people. No, Marie is not IPC, Jothan, she's BC.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks for clearing that, Mike. What would you suggest as an alternate list? Well, you put in Hector, would you switch out someone?

MIKE RODENBAUGH: I would take out Caleb or [inaudible] Benjamin, one of those three. Aren't all those people NCUC people?

JULIE HEDLUND: It's difficult to say, Mike, because that was not a question in their application. They were not having to identify their constituency. They were just applying as individuals, so we aren't ascribing a constituency or stakeholder group to them. Remmy.

REMMY NWEKE: Thank you. The question our colleague asked, you have already answered it. That's one of the things I wanted to respond to. Most of the applications or applicants are not necessarily NCUC members, and I don't think that was why, basis for the application. And then if we are looking at the balancing act by Jothan, which I very much appreciate, it shows that this particular outcome is more or less close to it. I think from here, I can only see Ben as coming from Africa, Caleb is [Northern America, Geoff is Europe,] and so on. And then Anil is also there. Basically, this outcome, this particular outlines more or less give us a wider representation if we must stick to the seven we are looking for. So, I think it's a good outcome anyway. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Remmy. Segunfunmi.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Yes, good day, everyone, once again. I must commend everybody for this beautiful chart. I think this is better represented at the moment. I have no objection to this chart. I think this covers the regions, and I'm sure they will do a good job.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that. Mike, I'm going to ask if you could put your full list of candidates in the chat, just so that we know. I know you mentioned—

MIKE RODENBAUGH: Am I right that four of the seven people are from [inaudible]?

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm sorry, you are breaking up for me, Mike.

MIKE RODENBAUGH: That's why I'm using the chat.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, Jothan says I believe you're correct, Mike. I think we've heard from everybody who's on the call. Karen, go ahead.

KAREN DAY: In chat, we were talking about swapping someone for Hector. If we swap Caleb out, then as Segunfumi noticed, [inaudible] North America has dropped out. But if we were to swap out Julf for Hector, Julf being the number five vote getter from Europe for Hector, then we would be swapping a Europe for a Latin America. There are many of other Europeans here. So, that would be the change that I could support. But I'd like to hear from everybody else.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. That's very helpful. Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I'm struggling to not look at this through lenses that were not provided to us. I don't have the privilege of knowing Caleb. I do know Julf. I'm looking at it through a lens of career tenure and what that brings into the mix. But I don't think that's specifically in our outline. I do like the idea of swapping out our number five or number six choices, potentially to help include Hector because he brings in two different important representations. But I don't want to say between the two other than that I would probably lean towards keeping Julf and maybe taking Caleb out in replacement for Hector.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Will that be acceptable to you, Mike and others?

KAREN DAY: May I make a suggestion? Can we just ask people to use their green check mark if they would support swapping Caleb? And then again, ask people to use the green check mark if they would support swapping Julf. We've got two alternatives that would meet Mike's requirement that he's brought up. So since people don't want to speak, maybe people will use their green check marks. If that's acceptable.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Karen. That's very helpful. So Jothan is asking red X for Caleb.

KAREN DAY: That works for me. We can do red for Caleb and green for Julf.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay, red for Caleb, green for Julf. Anyone who wants to contribute, please do so.

KAREN DAY: If you want to leave the slate the way it is, put up a cup of coffee.

JULIE HEDLUND: Four responses. Do we have a response from everybody? Let me look at the list. Karen, green check. Christian, green check. Jothan, red check. Remmy, do you have an indication? Red for Caleb, green for Julf. Segunfunmi, do you have an indication like that?

KAREN DAY: I was being serious when I said if you want to leave the slate the way it originally was, that's a valid choice to my proposed change if you want to keep it at the original seven. Then let us know that.

JULIE HEDLUND: We lost Mike, sadly. Hopefully he can rejoin. All right.

KAREN DAY: We really do need everybody that's here to let us know one way or the other.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay, Segunfunmi is coming in green. Remmy, do you have a vote?

REMMY NWEKE: With regards to, I've worked with Geoff and with regards to policy as well as Caleb. I've worked with two of them, even Ben as well. Like I mentioned, their nomination goes across. Caleb is from North America, where he's based. Geoff is from Europe and while Ben, for instance, is in Africa. So it's good that they have a good representation. If we were to look at the geo aspect of it. And just like we mentioned about Marie and Anil. I think their nomination or the application is [inaudible] Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm not sure I understood what your choice was though. If it would be for Caleb or for—go ahead.

KAREN DAY: Remmy, are you saying that you want to leave it with the original seven?

REMMY NWEKE: Yes, that was fine.

JULIE HEDLUND: Oh, thank you Karen for confirming.

KAREN DAY: So now we need Mike to participate, but Mike sure sounded like he was having an internet problem.

REMMY NWEKE: Sorry, are you making reference to original seven of today or the original seven of the previous week?

JULIE HEDLUND: Original seven of today.

REMMY NWEKE: Yes, okay, fine by me, thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: And so conclusion we have so far is three for Julf for Hector, one for Caleb for Hector, yes. Now Jothan is saying [inaudible] Julf being replaced by Hector. One for Caleb being

replaced by Hector and one for, as is, yes, that sounds right, Jothan. So that means that we're looking at the most support for Julf being replaced by Hector. Go ahead, Karen.

KAREN DAY: Can we ask that we clear our marks and then everyone again, green check, if you want to replace Julf for Hector, red X if you want to leave it at the seven that we had today, so go back to where we were before Mike suggested making a change. Red X, if you do not want to change the seven that are shown on the graph. Y if you want to make the change in order to get Hector on the slate. In essence, we picked who the change would be. But now we need to pick is there a change.

JULIE HEDLUND: So, yes, [inaudible] noted Julf for Hector is green and the original list is red.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Just to rephrase it for everybody on the call, because I see we've got like three votes. What we're trying to determine, we decided that if we did swap in Hector for someone, that it would be Julf. And now this vote is, are we going to make that swap or are we going to proceed with the seven as defined in the graph that's on the screen? Correct?

JULIE HEDLUND: That sounds right. I think.

KAREN DAY: Yes.

JULIE HEDLUND: All right. So, who do we have votes from so far? Karen, Christian, Jothan. Segunfunmi, proceed with the original or swap Hector for Julf for Hector?

JOTHAN FRAKES: So, I see in the chat that we have a red and I believe previously, Remmy, I don't want to speak out of turn for Remmy, but he had previously said that he wanted to proceed with the seven. So, I don't want to presume that he's also a red X, but I think that the red X's have won four to one. And I'm willing to accept that outcome.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very gracious of you, Jothan.

KAREN DAY: Julie, may I ask a procedural question?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, please.

KAREN DAY: If we put out a slate of seven and one member votes no, are we back to square one?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Yes, sadly, yes. It's full consensus.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I have just become a red X.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, and I should note we're not deciding here. We are deciding in the consensus call.

KAREN DAY: We're wanting to know what to put out on the email for the consensus call. If we put out a consensus call for seven candidates and one or more votes that haven't participated in this process at all is no, then we're back to square one.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Full consensus is a harsh taskmaster.

KAREN DAY: Yes. That's why I believe the council envisioned that everyone would send an alternate. But we can talk about that later.

JULIE HEDLUND: Exactly. [inaudible] supposed to appoint alternates if they're not participating.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So I have a question. I'm sorry, Julie, if I interrupted you. So if I'm hearing everything correctly, and I'm sorry to keep rephrasing stuff, but I know this is really important because this is our process. So we have decided that we're going to put forth this list of seven people. And then we're going to vote on it in the list. Is that how this is going to work or it's going to be another poll? What's the next step on this process?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks. That's a very good question. We won't vote. There'll be a consensus call by non-objection. So if we put these names to the list for a 48-hour consensus call, if there are no objections, they will be deemed approved by full consensus. If there is even one objection on the list to the consensus call, then we need to go back to the drawing board. We need to go back until there is full consensus, as long as it takes to get to that place.

No, we don't have the option of doing alternates. So, yes. Well, conceivably, we could say that we would do that. I mean, within our group, we could say that there's not a... I should rephrase this. There's not an option for alternates in the list of nominees for the

pilot-holistic review team, but this group could itself say that if one was withdrawn, that they would put forward another candidate. We could conceivably do that.

KAREN DAY:

I know we don't have the option to give them an eighth candidate, but I do note that the process is that from here, our slate of seven candidates will be given to the leadership of the SOs and the ACs. So, the chair of the GNSO, the chair of the ALAC, the chair of the GAC, and they will then pick 21 candidates to serve in this pilot. Could we send it? Here is our slate of seven, but chairman of the GNSO, if there is any shuffling of the list, we could also support Hector. I don't know how we get that input to the chair of the GNSO. Excuse me, who is then going to further refine what we do with the chairs of the other SOs and Acs.

JULIE HEDLUND:

They will. So, if we have specific input, such as a suggestion for an alternate, we can include that in the motion to the council, and we can stipulate that that information needs to be conveyed to the support staff for the pilot holistic review team and include it as information. It's true that the next step in the process is for the SOs and AC chairs to confirm final slate of the nominees. And I think that's exactly what it is, just to really just adopt or confirm the final slate. I don't think they're making... They're not empowered to make a decision, but that decision is made by each of the groups, so GNSO would have chosen its nominees. So, go ahead.

KAREN DAY:

Okay, thank you for that explanation. I did not understand that they would not be refining the list.

JULIE HEDLUND:

I think they're meant to just confirm the list. But let's see what we've got in chat here. Jothan says, understood. No alts. [inaudible] Okay, and we're seeing that Hector is not in the BC. It's a shame we've lost Mike. Hector is IPC. Thank you, Karen. Yes, and I'm

noting, Christian, you have a hard stop at the top of the hour. At this rate, we seem to be coalescing around the original seven nominees as ranked, as you see them on the screen. Jothan says we are coalescing, yes. I think we can, if people agree, we can put this list out. We can note that if one of the candidates were to drop out, that this group would support Hector as an alternative, and we could put that in the motion. We do have to submit an amended motion with the names, but we only we will only do that following the successful consensus call. But we can provide that guidance to the council, if that would be useful. I think we've taken us as far as we can go on this call. So does anybody object to taking this list of the nominees to the list for consensus call, while noting that there was support for Hector as an alternate if the need for one should arise, and that that guidance is going to be provided to the council with the stipulation that that information should be provided to the support staff of the Pilot Holistic Review? Any objections to that? I'm seeing support from Karen. I'm not seeing any objections or hearing them. Jothan says, "I appreciate considering the alt idea if that works. Otherwise just the seven." Well, there's nothing stopping us from providing that guidance to the GNSO, and for indicating that it be passed along to the team supporting the pilot of the holistic review, I mean, that's all we can do, and we can't require that there be an option for alternates, but for instance, we know one of the candidates is also a candidate for the GAC liaison, and conceivably that candidate could drop out for that reason, if selected for the GAC liaison. And I think we're in agreement on this call, for those on the call, and I will generate the consensus call email with this list, and the list of candidates in alphabetical order as opposed to in order of ranking. With Hector as an alternate. Back to Karen.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you. I just can't say thank you enough to Julie and Saewon for helping us navigate this somewhat tricky process. But like I said earlier, it's a good problem to have many qualified candidates. We'll take that any time over trying to come up with candidates that haven't applied. With that, we will close out today's call. We will look forward to non-responses to the consensus call. Thank you, everyone. Have a great afternoon, and be on the lookout for emails about the upcoming GAC GNSO liaison role. We'll take that one next.

JULIE HEDLUND: Look for a poll tomorrow for the GAC liaison, and a spreadsheet with the candidates and skills listed for to help you complete the poll, and we'll be meeting next Monday. You'll get an invite after this call.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, everyone. Have a good afternoon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]