

---

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call taking place on Wednesday, the 22nd of January, 2025. We have no apologies listed for today's meeting. 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 sessions governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

I'll turn the call back over to the chair, Karen Day. Please begin.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Terri. Good afternoon, good evening, good morning, everyone. I am always pleased when there is more community members on a call than staff members, so I feel good about going forward with this one. Thank you all again for your time last week, filling out the poll results, and for joining us today.

First of all, our normal order of business, does anyone have any updates to their SOI that they need to inform their group about?

Not seeing any hands, I will take that as a no, and we will move on. What I thought we would do today is go through the results for both of the positions that we had open and handle them separately rather than all at one time. This agenda, actually, when Saewon and I spoke this morning, we thought we would switch this up and go with the

---

*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.*

---

fellowship selection committee member first, since there is only one candidate for that. We thought that might be easy, knock that out. Then we would come back and look at the fellowship mentor program.

Saewon, if you have your deck loaded up and can take us through the responses to the selection committee member, I will turn it to you.

SAEWON LEE:

Sure, thank you, Karen. This is Saewon Lee from staff, for the record. Let me just switch the screen. As Karen just mentioned, we are switching up the orders just to look at the fellowship selection committee member survey results first. Before we start, thank you to all those that responded to the survey. We had five respondents for this particular one. Just upon request, I'm going to go through the list of respondents quickly. We had responses from Pedro Lana from NCSG, Julf Helsingius from NCSG, Segunfunmi Olajide from BC, Karen Day from Registry Stakeholder Group, and Natalie Howatson from Registrar Stakeholder Group. Again, thank you to those who responded.

This was a very simple survey because we only had one candidate. Most of you probably all saw already as we shared the results through the mailing list prior to the call. With this one candidate, we had everyone that responded to the survey favorable or in favor of this candidate to move forward. We did also have comments shared, which was also shared through the mailing list. I'll also be sharing this while we go into discussion through the chat. There's nothing much more to say to this particular poll just because it was just one candidate that received all in favor of this candidate.

---

So here I'll stop for discussions. But before we do move on, I'd like to open the floor to Karen and Julie first if they have anything to add.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Saewon. This is Karen. I have nothing to add. And after Julie, we'll just open it up for discussion. Julie, did you have anything to add? If not, we'll move on to Susan. Go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN MOHR:

Hi, everyone. I just wanted to follow up on the note that I put in the chat and apologize. I saw that application. And for whatever reason, I didn't see the link for the survey. So I assumed, which always gets you in trouble, that there wasn't a survey because there was only one candidate. But I do agree with the outcome. And that was my only comment today.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Susan. We reviewed Segunfunmi and I reviewed this with the staff this morning. We had suspected that one of our six who responded to the other survey had assumed that there was no survey for the single candidate. So completely understood there. And appreciate your support of this candidate.

Does anyone else have anything they would like to say about this candidate? Any in support, in favor of or not? Otherwise, we can move forward to having Julie issue the consensus call.

---

Very good. Not seeing anything. Julie, would you like to pick up with this consensus call?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, the consensus call will follow this meeting. So look for it after the 48-hour message after this meeting. Thank you.

KAREN DAY: Very good. Thank you, Susan. And with that, we can move on to our mentors, which we had a great group of applicants. Saewon, would you like to take us through those results?

SAEWON LEE: Yes, I will. So for this particular process, which is the Fellowship Program Mentor selection process, again, as Susan mentioned, we did have her included in the six respondents. So for this one, we had six responses, including Susan Mohr from ISPCP. This one was a bit more complicated than the one before, because first of all, we had 11 candidates. And because of the number of candidates, we received the result in the order of ranking that the respondents provided.

So as you can see in the screen, as well as what was shared in the mailing list prior to the call, the number in black is the average score of the order of preference that the respondents provided. And besides that, I have put in the order of ranking one, two, and three, according to the results. Now when you see the graph itself, you will see two eights, which are tied in number one, and three sevens, which are tied in number two. But when I went into detail per candidate to see the total,

---

as well as the average score, the red was how it was ranked. So Glen de Saint-Géry was the first, with an average score of 8.6. Imran Hossain was number two at 8.1. And then Mark Datysgeld was ranked three with an average score of seven.

So that's how they were ranked and basically, based on this, we can start our discussions. And before we go on to the discussions, I would like to again pass it on to Karen, if she has anything more to add.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Saewon. I will simply note that our current mentor that the SSC put in place last year is Mark Datysgeld, our number three candidate this time around. So depending on your perspective of whether new blood is good for the mentor program or consistency is better, you can factor that in. Mark is currently the mentor in place for the GNSO. That is my only comment on this. I think they are all great candidates. And I look forward to anything else anyone wants to contribute.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Well, I actually have two questions. One is about Mark. Do we have any feedback on his performance in his first term? And my second question is about Glen, that I do see on the other questions that on whether she's qualified or not. There was one vote for no. And I wonder if that would be interesting to know who voted no and why. I don't care who voted no, but why they voted no.

---

KAREN DAY: Yes. Thank you for pointing that out, Julf. As to feedback from Mark, I do not have any knowledge of any report on his current term. Any staff members that work with the mentor program, if there's anything that you would care to share, please do. We don't do 360 reviews like the NomCom does, so I'm afraid I don't have anything to contribute there. And Julie says she has no feedback either in the chat.

And with regard to Glen, I will note that she was our number two candidate last year. She came in second to Mark in our polling. But again, I agree with Julf. If the person who voted Glen not to be qualified is on the call and would like to speak to that, we would welcome that intervention.

NATALIE HOWATSON: Yeah. Hi. This is Natalie, for the record. No worries. I believe it was me that voted no, but I voted no for everyone that I didn't rank as one of my top three choices. So it's not necessarily that I'm voting no against Glen. So I have no issue with her being the candidate at all.

KAREN DAY: Okay. So if I can dive into that just a little bit more. Your no was not that I don't think she's qualified. It was I just think there's other better candidates.

NATALIE HOWATSON: Yeah, exactly. And also keep in mind, too, I am newer to the ICANN space, so I don't have a lot of historical information that other people might have.

KAREN DAY: Sure. Sure. Absolutely. Thank you for sharing your thought process behind that. That's great.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Just a procedural one. I actually got a message from Pedro that he's trying to join, but he's stuck in the queue.

PEDRO LANA: Hi. Thank you. You just accepted me.

KAREN DAY: Yeah. I was accepting. Welcome, Pedro. Just to bring you up to speed. We are looking at our mentor candidates. Saewon has laid out the results of our polling. And we have a one, two, and three who have floated to the top of our polling. And so we're just asking for feedback. If you have any feedback on any of the candidates, please let us know.

PEDRO LANA: What I think I can say, I voted for approval on those three. I thought the three had very strong backgrounds in [inaudible] probably among my top five. I don't know. [inaudible] There's just one thing that I would like to ask. If we do some, and this is a question, I don't know anything about this related to them. If we do some background check regarding the ombudsman, the ombudswoman in ICANN, because that would be

---

an important part of, I believe, dealing with newcomers. And I don't know if we'll do that in some moments.

JULIE HEDLUND:

I've never had any experience with any engagement of the ombudsman on any of the current or former candidates for any of the selection committee positions. So that's a good question, but I'm not sure how we would explore it in this instance. I'm not sure how we would proceed.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Yeah, it's a rather tricky one. It's actually really good that Pedro asked the question, because with one of the candidates, I have a concern that I've actually heard feedback from some people of sexism. I'm not going to mention who it is because I haven't been able to verify it objectively. But that's one where it would be good to get some sort of feedback, but I'm not sure if somebody like ombuds can actually tell whether there has been complaints about someone or not.

JULIE HEDLUND:

That's right, Julf. I think there's a question of confidentiality.

KAREN DAY:

I don't know that they could, but I also don't know that without announcing it prior to issuing the criteria that background checks would be a part of it, that we could implement that at this juncture.



PEDRO LANA:

Just to be clear, I don't think that this is an absolute necessity. It was just a doubt that I have if this was done at some moment, exactly because I have not seen it in the application form or identification instructions. It was more out of curiosity. I also agree that if we don't have it right now and this isn't a part of the process as it was structured, maybe it could be seen as unfair to add it, but I would like to know it and something that we can think ahead on next processes. But doing that in a more structured manner with people getting to know this is something that will be watched for.

KAREN DAY:

Yes, thank you, Pedro. And those are certainly conversations that we can continue with council and seek their direction on it as we are operating under their purview.

Not seeing any other comments or hands raised. I would propose that as Glen has demonstrated, as Saewon has shown in the chart, a clear differential with our number two candidate, Imran, that we issue a consensus call to confirm Glen as the mentor from the GNSO for the 2025 year. Any objections to that?

Not seeing anything in the chat or any hands. Julie, would you, once again, please issue a consensus call on behalf of the committee.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Karen. I will do that. I'll send the consensus call message following this meeting for 48 hours.

---

KAREN DAY: Thank you. All right, well we have taken care of those two items of business and I think we can now look towards our next selection, which is also due very shortly. Julie, would you like to tell us about the chair position for the Latin Diacritics PDP?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, certainly, Karen, thank you. So, the next order of business is the selection of the chair for the PDP working group for the Latin Diacritics. And this is unusual because this selection committee has not previously chosen a PDP chair, because generally there's only been one candidate for chair. We are blessed with two candidates. So we have been asked by the council to give our advice from this selection.

And so we're going to follow the same format for the selection process as all of our other selections. That is, we'll release a short poll for you to complete by next, or before next, the time of our next meeting, which is the 27th, next Monday at 08:00 PM UTC. And the timing is in the chat, thanks, everyone.

So, we'll ask for people to complete a short poll, and then we'll discuss the outcomes at the meeting on the 27th. And then submit the choice to the council for the confirmation. And that is to the 03 February for the 13 February meeting. And these are—you're seeing on the screen—the two candidates, Mark Datysegld and Michael Bauland. And so, that's the process we'll follow. Any questions?

---

SUSAN MOHR: I'm not available for the meeting on the 27th. How do you handle that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, much as today, where we have a discussion, the final decision is not actually taken until the consensus call is complete. So, as mentioned, there will be a consensus call to confirm the decision of the selection committee. So, until the consensus call is concluded, and assuming there is full consensus, the agreement is not considered complete. So, you will have the opportunity for your opinion to be considered in the poll and also in the consensus call.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Just checking on the procedures, because I'm not totally up to date on how we do things these days. So, what if in the consensus call somebody says no, and then we suddenly need extra time to negotiate, or how do we deal with that?

JULIE HEDLUND: We schedule another meeting. That's a good question. It has never happened, but it could happen. This group has to make a decision by full consensus. So, without full consensus, there is no decision, and we have to schedule a meeting and meet again until there is agreement. If there's no agreement between the candidates, we'll have to report that to the council. There's no possibility of reaching agreement, and I imagine we'd have to go back to another expression of interest process, but hopefully not. Like I said, it has never happened, but I guess there's a first time for everything. Let's hope not.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Thank you. I was familiar with the full consensus, but I was more concerned about that we have set some deadlines. And if we don't get full consensus, then those deadlines won't hold. But that's life, of course.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, we need to complete this process in the deadline. If not, it will take longer. But conceivably, we could put a placeholder motion in without a choice, and that would give us more time to make a decision. So, conceivably, we have until the 13th of February to make a decision.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Right, thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Hopefully, if we didn't reach a decision within a short amount of time, we're not likely to do so.

KAREN DAY: And I wanted to add a note for Susan. Depending on your availability, after the poll closes and staff circulates the results, if you have any questions or concerns based on those results that you want to have us explore during the call, even though you can't be here, please send an email to the group, and we can discuss it during the call, and then that

---

will be available for you on the recording to help you in your decision-making process.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Karen. That's a very helpful suggestion.

KAREN DAY: Can we just review again, Julie, that we will send out the poll, we'll open the poll tomorrow, and it will run through the weekend or through Friday?

JULIE HEDLUND: It will run through the weekend, at least Sunday, so that's allowing us time Monday for—yes, to close the poll Monday morning, with enough time to compile the results before Monday's meeting.

KAREN DAY: Is that an agreeable timeline for everyone? All right, great. Thank you, Julie. Again, thank you all for your contributions to this effort. Thank you, staff, for all your wonderful support, as always. Is there any other business anybody wanted to bring up before we let you have a half an hour of your day back?

Oh, not seeing anything. We will let you have a half an hour of your day back and draw this call to a conclude. We will let you have a half an hour of your day back.

---

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]