DEVAN REED:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Devan Reed for the recording. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Wednesday, 20th of August, 2025. We have no apologies listed today. 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, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you, and back over to Karen.
KAREN DAY:	Thank you, Devan. Hi, everyone. This is Karen Day, chair of the SSC, and welcome to today's call. I wanted to first start out by letting everyone know that we have a new participant with us today. Beth Marty from the Registrar Stakeholder Group is joining us today as a temporary alternate to our group because her colleague in the Registrars, excuse me, Natalie Halston, had to recuse herself from this particular process due to a conflict of interest with someone of her same employer. So welcome, Beth. Thank you for jumping in to help us on this.
	Does anyone else have any change of SOIs or other information that they need to let us know about? I'm not seeing any hands or any chat. We will move on, and today we're here to select the GNSO participants of the cross-community group for the review of reviews. As Saewon and staff circulated beforehand, all of our guidelines, including the advice that was passed at the GNSO Council last week, whereby they have

requested that one of these two seats be allotted to a sitting GNSO councilor. So we should all be familiar with that. Thank you for staff for making us all aware of the parameters. We had great participation in the survey this time. And so I will go ahead and turn it over to Saewon and let her walk us through the survey results and our polling. Saewon?

SAEWON LEE:

Thank you, Karen. And thank you also for introducing Beth to the group. Welcome, Beth. So this is Saewon Lee from staff, for the record. Just now in the chat, I shared with you the wiki page related to this review of reviews cross-community group selection process. I am sure you're already aware of this page as you probably checked the list of candidates and the information through this page. So as Karen also mentioned, the survey results, which I shared with you yesterday through the mailing list, can also be downloaded from today's meeting wiki page for your reference. And that was shared with you again in the chat by Devin.

Like always, I'll start by providing you with some background information on this survey and the selection process. So the survey opened last Tuesday, 12th of August and closed Monday, 18th of August, which obviously was shorter than usual due to this speedy process. Julf has a question in the chat. Should we have taken into account how much longer the candidates will be on the council? I wasn't guided on that fact. And this process itself is also, not this process, but the members that will be serving on this review of reviews cross-community group will also need to be delivering the results or delivering the outputs by next June. So I don't know if that is a

consideration. Obviously, we can consider this, but I wasn't really notified of that fact.

So just to continue on, we had in total eight responses this time out of nine, which was higher than usual. And they were Johan (Julf) Helsingius from NCSG, Susan Mohr from ISPCP, Pedro Lana also from NCSG, Karen Day from Registry Stakeholder Group, Frank Anati also from NCSG, Segunfunmi Olajide from BC, Mike Rodenbaugh from IPC and Desiree Miloshevic Evans from NomCom. I do want to note for the record that one response did come in after the deadline, because I actually closed the poll a bit later. And I did share this with you all through the mailing list as well. But this should not really affect the final decision. As you all know, the survey itself does not determine the outcome. But hopefully it's a reference to provide the views of the SSC members, which will help facilitate the discussions today. Obviously, once again, we value all your participation and input. So thank you to all those who responded this time. Again, especially as it was a quick turnaround since the last selection process.

So to share with you the results. So for this GNSO's nomination of the Review of Reviews cross-community groups process, we had, as you can see in the screen right now, five candidates in total. And as Karen mentioned, because one of them has to be a councilor, we had in total three councilors and again, just to highlight, out of the two members that we must select, one of them must be a councilor. And I hope there is no confusion there, which have been shared with you through the mailing list as well. And another thing to note was that through the charter, it was noted that efforts should be made to ensure that the CCG as in the cross-community group, has representation from all

ICANN's five regions. And luckily for us, we had a fairly even distribution of regions from the five candidates, which makes our process easier.

So to get into the details. As you can see in the screen, the number in black is the weighted average score of the candidates, and besides that, the yellow highlights represent the top three overall, and the blue highlight the top two among the councilors. Sophie Hey has ranked number one overall with an average score of four. And as some responders noted, she seems to have submitted a strong application, has a strong background and her experience on the pilot holistic review team makes her uniquely suited for this role. As for ranks two and three overall, they're both councilors. Number two being Osvaldo Novoa, and he showed an average of four rounded up from 3.5. And Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, an average of three rounded from 3.13. If you see below here.

When you see the basic statistics, the interesting points are, and this is related to the councilors selection. But both Osvaldo and Lawrence received number one in rankings, while Lawrence Olawale-Roberts received one lowest rank, so rank number five. And secondly, though, both the mean and the median. So the mean, which is the average of all responses and the median, which is the midpoint. Osvaldo Novoa scored both slightly higher than Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. So the standard deviation is slightly lower for Osvaldo Novoa. And thirdly, I'd like to point out that in the yes and no responses, while Lawrence did not receive any no's, Osvaldo Novoa did receive two no's. I think that pretty much sums up the survey results. I'm just going to go back to the ranking screen so that you can see all this. Again, the individual responses and comments per candidate can be viewed through the

responses all file that was all shared with you. And obviously, in the comments, while both councillors were seen as strong candidates, with if you see the responses, you will see that both councillors were seen as strong candidates with sufficient expertise and understanding of ICANN reviews. But there were a few differences in the responses related to the yes and nos, as well as the statistics. So with this result, I will hand the floor back over to our chair Karen, so that you can start with the discussions for the selection of candidates. Karen, over to you.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, Saewon. Thank you again for putting all this together and making it so easy to understand and then walking us through it. What I would like to propose is that we take the easiest piece first, or what I perceive to be the easiest piece first, and that is that we confirm our number one candidate, Sophie Hey, who received rankings of either first or second in all the poll results and had the highest overall score, due I think in large part to her co-chairing of the Holistic Pilot Review, Pilot Holistic Review, excuse me, I got that backwards, which is one of the main factors of why we're here today doing a review of reviews together. So I would propose that we, if agreeable, we confirm Sophie as one of the two representatives from the GNSO, and then we can move on and discuss the councilor seat with our remaining time. Does that work for the rest of the team? Anybody have any different thoughts on that? I see some agreement. Yep, works. Great. All right. Well, would anyone like to speak either in favor of or with any reasons not to confirm Sophie Hey as one of the two GNSO seats?

BETH MARTY: Yes. Hi, Beth. I did not take the poll, and I apologize for that, but I so I wanted to like affirmatively state that I agree with this ranking, and I think she would do an excellent job. She has been very involved in fully appreciating and understanding the review of the reviews process and its implications. Thank you.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, Beth. Appreciate that. All right. With that, any other commenters, speakers? Not seeing any, I would move forward and ask that staff proceed with slotting in the name of Sophie Hey as the first name on our consensus call to be distributed soon. Thank you, Saewon. Now, with that easy bit done, let's move on to talk about the seat for the serving councilor. Saewon has walked us through the details of each of those. We have Osvaldo and Lawrence who seem to be in contention for the seat. Hong-Fu seems to not have quite met the same standards, so I would move that we discuss Osvaldo and Lawrence and see if we can come to a mutual decision on a candidate. And with that, I'll open the floor to anyone that would care to speak to offer any insight into either of these candidates.

MIKE RODENBAUGH: Thanks, Karen. It's Mike Rodenbaugh. Well, I would note just from Saewon's further detail on the call that the rankings were actually very close. I guess it was 3.5 but was rounded up to 4 versus 3.13, so not much difference in the polling. For me, the big difference was in the applications. Osvaldo really didn't provide hardly any detail, and that's why, I mean, frankly, I didn't have anything to go on as to whether he

was qualified or not, so I said I was one of the two people, I guess, that said no. I think Lawrence did a very, very thoughtful job on the application, and therefore, for me, he's a much stronger candidate.

SUSAN MOHR: Hi, thanks. This is Susan. Yeah, Mike, I agree. I think that in some aspects, I think that Lawrence has some strengths, and I think the reason, though, that at least for me, I ranked Osvaldo higher is because of his history with ICANN generally. I guess a couple of things. His history of ICANN generally and the work that he's done and the leadership roles that he's taken on over the years in his engagement with ICANN, coupled with his business experience, and I think that those things were laid out in the application, where with his business experience, he has worked on internal reviews and audits, and so he's familiar with these types of complex issues, just based on his work experience, and he also brings to the table experience with the ATRT-3, and so for me, when I was looking at the applications, I was looking for that sort of experience, someone that can come to this with a history and background and deep knowledge, not only in ATRT-3, but ICANN review process and a good understanding of the bylaws, so for me, I felt like Osvaldo is a really strong candidate for this role.

JOHAN (JULF) HELSINGIUS: Right, first, so not addressing these two at all, but of a general observation, that's, to me, it did feel a little bit like some of the applications smelled a little bit ChatGPT-ish, which is just a general observation, and of course, there's nothing against it as such, but that's

just how it felt, but addressing this Osvaldo versus Lawrence, I agree that Osvaldo really has a great experience with the organization and ICANN procedures from a long time, which really also kind of supports him, in my view. I have worked with both of them on the council, and so Lawrence is very keen and active, but he just doesn't have the depth of experience that Osvaldo has. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Comparing the two candidates, right, my view as per the information provided is that Lawrence, so the GNSO has two representatives on the drafting team, or the council, rather, representing the GNSO on the drafting team for the review of reviews, which I guess Lawrence is also one of those representatives in the drafting team, which gives him much more advantage on the subject matter. Also, I saw a comment on the chat asking if we are to consider the [inaudible] the council. So, considering the expectation of this, I also think Osvaldo will no longer be on the council seat by next year, whereas the CCG will still be in progress. So, Lawrence currently co-chairs the review of reviews charter drafting team, like I mentioned, which gives him much more advantage. So, that's why I also ranked Lawrence higher in terms of active engagement on the current subject matter. And also, considering the duration of the CCG, Lawrence will still be much more at the council, which makes him more suitable for that role, since the council demand we have a councilor on seat. So we shouldn't appoint or nominate a candidate who is no longer going to be at the council when CCG process is still ongoing. I hope you get what I mean. Thank you.

EN

KAREN DAY: That's very helpful information. Susan, did I see you want to speak?

SUSAN MOHR: Sorry, I think I was on mute. I did have my hand up briefly and I think you're right, I just have to confirm that Osvaldo is on the council for at least one more year, and I guess I'm not certain beyond that. I will be replacing Thomas record whose term expires at the end of this year and Osvaldo will continue for the following year.

KAREN DAY: Got it. Thank you. So I guess the question is, how long do we think the CCG is going to take. I see Saewon put in the chat this work should be done by June of 2026. And so yes, Osvaldo will then term out at AGM in 2026. Thanks for that.

MIKE RODENBAUGH: I cannot imagine this work is going to be done in less than a year. And by June of next year, that just, that seems extremely fanciful to me. So, I don't know, I would suspect that this is multi year project just based on the scope. And I've been around ICANN for a long, long time. So I take the point that Osvaldo may well not be on the council during a big portion of this work. And I appreciate the information also that Lawrence was involved in the drafting team and so has a lot of notable recent experience on these issues.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, Mike. I'm seeing Julf's comment in the chat, Lawrence's term ends 2025. Segunfunmi, has Lawrence been reelected from his constituency? Do you know

SENGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Yes. Yes, that's correct. He's been reelected so I think he has about two more years on the council seat.

KAREN DAY: Okay. All right. Thank you for that. Two more years. All right. Well, anybody else, any other input? Seems to me like survey results, we are pretty evenly divided. We've had three speak in favor of Osvaldo, and two speak in favor of Lawrence, and some that haven't spoken one way or the other, me included. So I think we should do a quick raising of hands and give those who have not spoken a chance to indicate their preference. I'm trying to look at the reactions tools. Could we have a green checkmark from those who would support Osvaldo for the seat. All right, we have three checkmarks for Osvaldo. All right, if you could take those down. And then thumbs up for those that would support Lawrence. Three thumbs up for Lawrence. Who's got a penny we can toss? Saewon, you have some magic in your staff bag?

SAEWON LEE: Unfortunately not. It is a very tight score.

EN

KAREN DAY: I will say that the reason I personally leaned towards Lawrence in this voting round was due to the fact that he will be on council for another two years. I, like Mike Rodenbaugh, tend to think that having this done during 2026 with everything else that's going on with ICANN to be a bit wishful thinking.

BETH MARTY: I will say that I'm very bullish that it can get done. I don't think I put the check up in time. I was voting for Osvaldo.

KAREN DAY: I counted you. Saewon, what is the advice from staff? Pedro's coming in now, maybe he could add some—Oh, excellent. Pedro, welcome to the call. I hate just put you on the spot, but are you available to weigh in if we give you a little background of what we've just been over?

We are discussing the two leading candidates for the councilor seat on the review of reviews team. Our surveys and our numbers were very close for both Lawrence and Osvaldo. So we have spent the last few meetings discussing points in favor of each candidate. Each candidate has had an equal number of supporters. Some relevant facts that were brought to light are that Osvaldo will be on council for one more year, so in other words, through the AGM in 2026. Lawrence will be serving on the Council two more years as he's just been reelected to his position, he will be there through a GM of 2027. So, we've had both views express that the cross community group will complete its work by the summer of 2026, well within the term of both councilors. Others have expressed less optimistic views and feel that the work is going to

take on into the 2027 year, and so it would need a councilor who's going to have a longer tenure. We had a straw vote. We had three members supporting each of the two candidates. If you would like to, and I would hope you would be willing to express your views and perhaps help us break our deadlock, we would be most grateful. And if there's any questions you want to ask us, just please. You had voted Osvaldo over Lawrence. All right then. That gives us four votes for Osvaldo, and three for Lawrence. Does anyone have any reason why staff should not move forward with that result? Not seeing any hands, not seeing any comments in the chat. I think we are all grateful for Pedro for joining the call when he did. And we would now ask staff to move forward with Osvaldo Noova as the second name on the list.

SAEWON LEE: And I just want to mention in the chat, Mike has said it reflects the polling of the broader group, so I'm good with it. There's a question from Segunfunmi, so what happens when Osvaldo is out of council? I know it sounds very optimistic, but at least according to the charter, the current deliverables are stated as by ICANN 86, which is June of next year. Obviously, other than that, I can't really give you any more details or weigh in on this matter. But if everyone's happy with this, yes, staff is happy to move forward with this result.

KAREN DAY: So, yeah, so I want to agree with what Mike has said here, you know, council could well say next year if the work is continuing, if Osvaldo has been a good reporter to the team that they want him to continue for

continuity's sake and, you know, they won't want to replace him with a current councilor, there'd be no reason he couldn't continue on the group because he moves off of council.

SAEWON LEE: Great, thank you for emphasizing that, then if everyone's good to go, I'm just going to show you the timeline related to the next steps. So with the result that we have today, a consensus call message will be sent out for the next 48 hours following this meeting. So that would mean, as you can see in the screen, by 22nd of August, so this Friday, and if no objections to the result, the preliminary decision will be sent to the reviewer reviews cross community group support team prior to council confirmation so that they could have this information because as I understand it, they are to start this work immediately. And then this result will also be sent to the GNSO council for their confirmation on 18th of September during their council meeting. I think with that, I can hand it back over to Karen.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, Saewon. Devan, can you put back up the agenda, make sure I'm not, all right, so we've gone through our next steps, our consensus call, the fact that council will be confirming these selections, probably after they've already begun work. Does anyone else have any ARB? And for that, I will throw myself in the first queue and go to ask our all knowing staff, is there anything that you foresee coming between now and Dublin for the SSC?

SAEWON LEE:	As of now, I don't foresee anything. I haven't heard of anything. If at all, the next election process would be starting at the end of the year. And this is to do with the fellowship program, the mentor process. But other than that, I don't, I have not been notified of anything.
KAREN DAY:	Thank you. Appreciate that. Excuse me. All right, then, with that, anybody else have anything else? Otherwise, we'll let you have 20 minutes of your day back. Not seeing anything, I will again thank everybody for their participation in the process. Thank you to staff as always for all your hard work. This, we couldn't do this without you. So thanks again, everybody. Have a great rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]