

---

**ICANN Transcription**  
**Standing Selection Committee**  
**Monday, 15 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/DIDKF>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the

GNSO Master Calendar Page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/groupactivities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call taking place on Monday, the 15<sup>th</sup> of July 2024.

We have apologies from Karen Day, Arsene Tungali, and Bruna Martins. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space 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 multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With that, I will turn it over to Segunfumi Olajide. You may begin.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE:

Good morning, good afternoon, or good evening from wherever you're calling from. For the record, my name is Segunfumi Olajide. It's such a pleasure to be standing in on behalf of Karen to chair this for some event. I sit at the position as the vice chair, but having to step up to do this today is such an honor. I trust that I'm going to do well. To jump

---

*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.*

---

into the agenda for today, our primary focus today is GNSO GAC Liaison candidates, which we'll have two candidates for evaluation. At this point, I will turn it to Saewon for the survey.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Segunfumi. Hello, everyone. Saewon Lee from staff for the record. Before I start, I do want to share the—hello?

JULIE BISLAND: We can hear you.

SAEWON LEE: Okay, great. Before I share the screen, I do just want to share the file with you, if you can hold on for me. This is the survey results for your review. Let me share my screen. Can everyone see the screen well? Yes, perfect. Great.

The survey was a bit more simple this time than last time because we only had two candidates. For this survey tool that we use, we received five responses. Unfortunately, just to give you a conclusion, it's different from last time because, weirdly, we didn't really receive any ranking results from all five responders. I'm starting to wonder if there was even that question presented for you, but there just were no responses related to the ranking that we requested. So I decided to go a different route. Great. Thank you, Jothan. Basically, because of the way that the results were presented for each candidate as well as no ranking that was submitted from the responders, I think the best way that I could show the result was through a pie chart this time.

---

First of all, as you can see, the two candidates that you can see on screen left to right, the first candidate, Sebastien Ducos, shows 100% yeses from all five responders. Sophie Hey, on the other hand, has divided results from two yeses, two nos, and one I don't know. That was basically how the result was presented. I don't think I would need to obviously state the rank at this point as I think it's pretty obvious. I think Jothan is mentioning that Remmy has dropped. I don't know if you want me to pause here, Julie or Segunfunmi. Okay, I'm just going to go on then.

With that, because I don't have a ranking to show, and it is pretty obvious, I just want to share with you some comments that were shared. Related to Sebastien, there was a comment from a responder. "He has been in leadership at the GNSO Council which gives him good understanding of the role as a liaison and of the GAC as an entity. I think he is the best candidate," is one comment that I received.

Then there are two comments that were also shared at the end. Sorry. I know the screen is a bit small. Maybe I'll change this to one page this time. As you can see, there were two responses just related to the any additional comments or observations question. The first being, "Two strong candidates. Tiebreaker for me was where SSC identified Sophie Hey for PHR group and balancing that time commitment." The second response being, "As former GNSO Council chair, Sebastien Ducos has significantly better experience for this role."

That's pretty much the result of the survey, as I said, because of the number of candidates that was significantly lower than the previous

---

survey that we did. I think this is pretty much what I can share with you at this moment. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Saewon. Should we go to a discussion? We can discuss here the results that we received, any comments and suggestions people have. I see Jothan's hand is up.

JOTHAN FRAKES: You can always count on me for raising my hand. I made the comment about Sophie. I think these are both fantastic candidates. I think we're really blessed to have both of them. They both have quite a lot of strengths. Mine was the comment about balancing the time commitment that I know he had made that a consideration when we were discussing Mark Datysgeld in the PHR waiting. It felt like a matter of consistency to apply that same balance here as far as what the time commitments were for that. That was my comment and what was behind that comment. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Jothan. That's helpful. Any further comments from anyone else? This is the time for the discussion. Anybody have suggestions for a different result than what we have here? Remmy, please.

REMMY NWEKE: All right. Thank you. Unfortunately, when the results came up, my network started acting up, so I was knocked off the Zoom.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excuse me, Remmy. The result was that it seemed that the poll seemed to favor Sebastien Ducos over Sophie Hay.

REMMY NWEKE: Okay. I still think that Sebastien stands more like it, if you ask me. Sebastien stands more like it. I have known him for a long time and his contribution within the industry cannot be downplayed, really. He's more or less a walking encyclopedia for the Internet community. I haven't been there. I think the result is good for itself. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Remmy. I'll just call on some people so we can make sure we haven't missed anyone. I hope people don't mind. Next on list is Christian. Do you have any comments for us?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Can I be heard?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, indeed.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Okay. I don't have any particular comments to share. I was one of the contributors to the survey and am happy with how it came out. I think

---

that if we decide to move forward with Sebastien as our candidate, he'll do an excellent job.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Christian. That's very helpful. Segunfumi, do you have any comments?

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Great. I think we're moving in the right direction. Everybody on the call has commented, and then they've shared their views. It seems we don't have any objection to the results of the poll. I think we can move on with this.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. I don't think I see anybody else that hasn't spoken so far on the call. Of course, this will go off for a consensus call. Everybody on the list will have a chance to respond and object, if necessary. Yes, exactly, Jothan. Jothan, go ahead. Your hand is up.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I'm one of those kids who, I think, when I would get a coloring book, would color outside the lines. Just like I had proposed when we were including Hector as an alternate, could we propose that two strong candidates, Sebastien was a choice, if possible, or an alternate was needed that Sophie would be a strong candidate for alternate or something to that nature?

JULIE HEDLUND: We can certainly do that. We're doing that for Hector. I don't see that we can't do that. But there is no alternate position as part of the job description, but that doesn't mean the Council can't take that advice.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Sometimes that's very helpful. I know in other groups where we have to find somebody step in if somebody goes on holiday leave or other kinds of leave, that's always great to have that on deck, even if it is outside of the speck. But I follow guidance and we should be following what we're asked to do. It's just that little extra. I'm always the person who likes to put a little garnish on the side of the meal at dinner to make it a little nicer. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Now, it's a question that's coming. Obviously, it was a question that arose during the PHR process that just concluded with Hector. But it also has been considered by the SSC in previous discussions, and in fact that the SSC determined that it wanted to retain the option of putting forward advice on alternates where that would be an option. I don't know that's not an option for the GAC liaison. I can't think of why we would not be able to do that. I mean, strictly speaking, if the GAC liaison were not to be able to serve, there would be another selection process, and likely, we would get the same result as we're getting here. Let me see how we can phrase this and I'll put that out as part of the call for consensus and think how best we can phrase that bit

---

of advice for the Council. I think it's a helpful suggestion. Anyone else have any suggestions or any objections with that approach?

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Thank you, Julie, for sharing. I think that helps. We can go with that option of adding his name or our name as alternate, just a recommendation to the Council.

JULIE HEDLUND: As Jothan says in the chat, as a suggestion part of the consensus call, yes. Thank you. We'll do that, take that action. The consensus call will go for 48 hours and conclude, and then a motion will be prepared for the August meeting since we've passed the motion deadline for the July meeting. But it's no problem because the liaison does not take up the position until the Annual General Meeting which is in November. So we have plenty of time. Is there anything else anyone wants to discuss with respect to the GAC liaison selection process?

REMMY NWEKE: No from my end. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Once again, Segunfunmi, I'd like to go to a couple of loose ends with respect to the Pilot Holistic Review process, if you don't mind.



---

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: All right, thank you. If I get you clearly, I think we've all had the consensus on this particular one. So we need to move to the next agenda. Can we put up the agenda again?

JULIE HEDLUND: I can put the agenda back up, if you'd like to stop sharing, Saewon. Let me get that back up one moment, please. One moment. There it is. The next item is next steps, the PHR nominees. There are two things to inform the SSC. First, staff is preparing an amended motion. A placeholder motion was submitted by the document and motion deadline of the 8<sup>th</sup> of July. And now that motion is amended with the seven names and alternate for Council. Those names will be presented in the ranked order that we discussed at last week's meeting. I mentioned that because the next step in the process... Let me just move to Pilot Holistic Review process to remind you what it entails. One moment while I bring that screen up. Can you see now the separate screen, PHR process? Let me see. Yes, good. Thank you, Saewon.

Just looking down the information here, the second paragraph, and drawing your attention to the process that was each SO and AC has the opportunity to nominate seven applicants, which we did. We have nominated seven. Then when this process concludes, the SO/AC leaders conduct the selection process and the review team may contain up to 21 members. Now, strictly speaking, if every SO and AC returned seven nominees and seven members, that would be too many. There are seven SOs and ACs, so we would be over 21. But in reality, it is unlikely that each SO and AC is going to return seven nominees. We have the

---

GNSO, but for instance, the ASO, not to single them out particularly, but the ASO may not fill seven candidates.

Essentially, we may have a further selection process from our seven nominees. And then not to be placed in front of the SSC, but the SO/AC leaders will conduct this process. But we should give them guidance, in particular the GNSO chair. That's why we're doing the motion with the candidates in order of rank to make that process simpler. Now, we're hoping that not all SOs and ACs put forward all their possible candidates so we won't come to this point. But if we do, the GNSO make it for the selection if necessary. I'll pause there and if there are any questions. Jothan?

JOTHAN FRAKES:

You can count on me like a sun rising. I think I'm hearing in your summary that we've provided the seven and then we'll have to see from the other SO/AC what they've proposed. I guess I'm trying to distill this down so that I'm really clear on what our action items here. Are you saying that we need to make recommendations about the criteria that they should use in narrowing it down to 21 members? Are we called to narrow it down to 21 members? I'm trying to clearly understand what our action item is for this. I'm sorry, I'm a little lost, if I can be really honest. But my coffee hasn't entirely kicked in.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Understood. It might help if we return to the—let me just look again at the screen that has the selection process. The SSC does not need to do anything further. So this is not a call to action for the SSC because we've

---

already ranked the candidates in order. We did that last week. That ranking is being provided in the motion to the Council. So they already have the guidance they need. What I'm pointing out is that it may be that the GNSO Council gets its seven nominees. My point is that there's a possibility they might not get seven. They might get six or five or four or three. They will get no less than three. Because three times seven is 21. So each SO and AC gets at least three nominees and possibly more, depending on how many nominees each SO and AC put forward. But the minimum is three. I would say the SSC is done. The SO/AC chairs are not done. There's still the selection process that they have to conduct. Let me just give you the timing of that. It's all on the screen here. It's part of this.

Okay. Here we are. The SO/AC chair selects review team members and identifies review leadership from the list of nominated applicants. That happens from 12 August to 6 September. We will have our nominees approved by Council at the meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> of August. We'll be in time for that part of the selection process. Then the members are informed on the 9<sup>th</sup> of September, and then the group kicks off 13<sup>th</sup> of September. That's the timing.

The reason for knowing this is just that it's possible that Greg might bring us the help, and conceivably, we could constitute the SSC quickly if we need to. But we have provided guidance that hopefully will be enough to carry Greg DiBiase into the next phase, the SO/AC chair selection process. This is truly just a heads up so that the SSC is not surprised if there is indeed a further selection process that has to happen depending on how many nominees each SO/AC filled for this team. I hope that's helpful.

---

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Thank you, Julie, for sharing details. I think these serve us the overall timeline, which has given us better perspective as what we expect from the PHR process.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Segunfumi. That was all we had on our agenda today.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: I think the next one on the agenda is Any Other Business. Yes. That's correct.

JULIE HEDLUND: Does anybody have any other business? I'm not seeing any hands up. What is in item 7, Segunfunmi? I'm sorry.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Okay, Julie, item 7 talks about, since you have finished the job, it's time for you to go for refreshments.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm not sure I understand your question.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Well, it's a kind of a joke that if you have finished the job, it's time for you to go for a refreshment.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. I got it. Very good. Clearly, it is time for me to go for refreshments. Very good. Excellent. Segunfumi, I think it's over to you to close up the call.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Okay. Thank you once again, staff, Julie B., Julie Hedlund, and Saewon. Thank you, every member of the SSC team, for your contributions and standing in today. In the absence of no other business, I think we can adjourn the meeting. When is going to be our next meeting?

JULIE HEDLUND: We don't have any meetings scheduled at the time because we don't have any selection processes pending. If we should, then we'll go ahead and circulate it and do a scheduled meeting. But right now, we don't have any scheduled.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Okay. That's great. So in that case, maybe we have to go with item 7 as suggested by Remmy.

JULIE HEDLUND: Wonderful. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Thank you all.

---

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks so much for sharing. Very much appreciate it. Thanks all for joining.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Thank you all. It's a privilege too. I appreciate it.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**