
JULIE BISLAND: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Monday, the 27th of January 2025.

We have apologies from Susan Moore today. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording, and 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. With that, I will turn it over to Karen Day. Thanks, Karen.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, Julie. Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to our second call, and just a very short time. Does anyone have any updates for their SOIs that they need to inform the group of since our last meeting? I'm not seeing any hands or comments in the chat. We will take that as everybody is status quo in their SOIs. I will turn you over to the capable hands of Saewon to walk us through our input results from the weekend's survey. Saewon, please.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Karen. This is Saewon Lee from staff for the record. Let me just switch my screen as I share the results with you all. I hope everyone can see this. If you can't, please leave in the chat or raise your hands, please.

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.

Okay. So the results were shared with the team through the mailing list a few hours before this call. I shared two files with you, one was a summarized data and one was individual responses to each candidate, including the comments. And obviously, these comments and the individual responses was to help for this discussion to provide a full context of the opinions or perspectives of each candidate.

As you can see in the screen, just to kind of give you the summarized ranking that was provided, so just before we go into this, we did receive all nine responses or nine results from each stakeholder group and constituency. So thank you all for your participation in the survey. But again, just to remind you all, this whole result is not in any way to determine the results, but merely just to help the team in the discussions today. But either way, the participation was very much appreciated. So again, thank you all.

Based on this, the ranking, as you can see in the screen, was actually provided by seven respondents, two of the nine actually skipped the ranking, and the seven respondents resulted in six of them voting in favor of Michael Bauland. So if you can see in the screen, the numbers in black are the weighted average, and the numbers highlighted in yellow and red numerically is the actual ranking. So, as you can see, Michael Bauland is the clear winner in the result that was provided. As you clearly also saw in the results—and this is again to provide you with a bit more context through the discussions—though this was the ranking, Michael did receive two NOs, and the NOs came from those two that skipped the ranking question.

I think this pretty much summarizes the survey result. So with this, I will hand the floor over to Karen to help with the discussions.

KAREN DAY: Thank you, Saewon. Open up now for comments and feedback from the members. Julf, please.

JOHAN HELSINGIUS: I had two questions, that procedural questions. Again, I'm new to this round or the Selection Committee, so I'm not familiar with all the procedures. But has it been normal that you also actually show who polled how and who commented what? I seem to remember that we used to do it anonymously, but now the names seem to be visible.

My other question has to do with the fact that I understand that we actually extended the deadline by two hours, sort of very late. And I just wonder if was it because people hadn't responded enough and should we just keep deadlines deadlines? Thanks.

KAREN DAY: Thanks, Julf. To the first point, based on our call, there is no hard and fast rule as to sharing the input based on our last call, where people were questioning some comments that were made but made it anonymously. Then the people that made those comments then spoke to their comments and explained their comments. I felt like that the additional layer of transparency was welcomed, and based on that, I made the decision this morning. I asked Saewon to please just share the comments in full and not worry about redacting people's names

because I felt like people appreciated knowing the context of the comments. So, knowing, for instance, that a candidate is from one stakeholder group, and the commenter from that same stakeholder group had this view. So that was my call and that was on me. If the consensus going forward from this team is that everything be done anonymously and we give people the opportunity to own their comments on the calls, that's perfectly acceptable, and I will happily do that going forward.

With regard to the two hours, that was a call that staff made, and that was because we had only two of our members that hadn't responded. And again, remember, we're not voting in these polls. These polls are just a mechanism for us to share feedback amongst our group to hopefully make our call time more productive and our calls go a little bit smoother. So staff extended the time, reached out to the two people who hadn't responded, and then they put their feedback in. In regard to that, again, I was fine with that. But if the consensus of the group is that we should have a deadline as a deadline and not extend and force those folks to come to the call to contribute, again, we can certainly do that. But again, I just wanted to get across the point that those aren't votes. We can get on the call and we can say, "You know what, the votes were this way, but really, we come around to a consensus that different results are merited." So it's just a feedback. I didn't see any problem with extending the deadline that staff did. So I hope that answers your question. Yes, go ahead.

JOHAN HELSINGIUS: Just responding to that. Firstly, I have no sort of strong opinion whether things should be anonymous or not. It's just that it should be consistent and at least we should know in advance. I think it's major rule. That's all. When you issue a poll, just let people know whether it's going to be anonymous or not. I am just as a believer in strict deadlines, because we had people who actually made a lot of effort to actually try to get the answers in, and then they go, "Well, what's the point if that deadline isn't a deadline?"

KAREN DAY: Points taken on both counts, Julf. Thank you. Desiree, please go ahead. Desiree, you might still be on mute.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Apologies. Finding the button. Can you hear me now?

KAREN DAY: Yes. Thank you.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Good. Just to echo a little bit on these deadlines, I just would have liked to know that the deadline was extended for two hours, but I'm glad that we have the feedback from everyone and what is now the next step. Thank you.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Desiree. The next step is that, over the course of this call today, people will express their opinions if they are comfortable moving forward, as the survey results indicate, with Michael Bauland being the nominee that we send back to Council, or if people wish to express opinions to the contrary, and they can certainly do that. But that's why we're here today, is to either confirm Michael or Mark as our candidate. I'm happy to kick things off and say that I would gladly confirm Michael as the candidate. I think he's got some niche knowledge that the Registries feel like he has some niche knowledge this particular PDP is going to need to keep itself on track.

Anyone else? All right, well, are we then happy to—oh, Segunfunmi, please.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE:

I just feel after raising the question, I'm just curious as to the question that was raised by Julf originally. Yes, I know the poll has always worked and it has been a very good approach in getting our consensus candidate. But on the second thought, looking at the result of the polls today, you now realize that, okay, it seems already that the poll carries the voice of a larger number of people, considering that we have just two candidates, which automatically makes the decision to tilt towards the person who has the highest ranking already. So I don't know how to put the question but I feel if we already have result tilting towards one candidate, automatically it means we just have to tilt towards that direction. Please correct me if I'm wrong.

KAREN DAY:

I think you are not wrong. I just wanted to give anyone who wanted to bring any additional information to light that might cause people to change their minds the opportunity to do so. I have seen that happen before in these meetings, but I will note, take everyone's quietness today as agreeing with my suggestion and Desiree second, that we move forward to nominate Michael to the Council as the new chair of this PDP. Julie, would you like to walk us through next steps again? Julie Hedlund?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Sorry, Karen. Hard to come off mute. Okay. To remind everybody of the process, the next step in the process is the consensus call. This is by full consensus. So at the end of this call, we'll send an e-mail asking everybody if there's agreement of consensus for Michael Bauland, and if there are any objections, that will go back and schedule another meeting, have another discussion. So there is an opportunity for those people who might not be on the call at this time to weigh in if they have any objections. That will be open for 48 hours and then closed. And if there's no objection, then the decision goes up for Council confirmation. Thank you.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Julie. I'm seeing support in the chat. Unless Saewon or anyone else has anything to add, I think we can give you guys back a few minutes of your time today, and we'll look forward to the follow-up e-mails from Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND:

One other item we had on the agenda. Some wanted to review the charter. So if I ask Saewon to bring up the charter. The charter has the provision annually for a review if it seeks a review of the charter. It did not review its charter last year. It did review the charter in 2023 and made some adjustments here. You see this just from the charter on the screen. This is you may request from the GNSO Council a review of it annually or if the members are identifying a need for specific review. In the last meeting, Pedro had noted then we might want to consider some background information in considering the candidates or mentor specifically if there are any complaints of the Ombudsman. So maybe that this group might want to look at the charter and make some specific persons for a review of candidates, or alternately, this group may wish to hear from the new Ombudsman and hear how she conducts her process to review complaints and what cooperation may or may not be available to like the SSC. If this group is interested then we can bring this as an action item. We could discuss the charter and see if there's any interest in reviewing any aspects of it and/or inviting the Ombudsman to address the group. Thank you.

KAREN DAY:

Thank you, Julie. Does anyone have any thoughts about that opportunity?

PEDRO LANA:

Yeah. Pedro for the record.

KAREN DAY: Yes.

PEDRO LANA: Just to mention that as of now, I wouldn't have any immediate suggestions. It's great to know that they have this opportunity, but I think we would have to discuss it further, even if to find other things that could become suggestions. But for now, it's just good to know that there is this possibility.

KAREN DAY: Yes, agreed, Pedro. Thank you very much. We can simply leave with everyone the homework assignment, and I can send a note out to the team with, again, links to the charter while we have a wall, because I believe, Julie, confirm we don't have any other nominations that we'll need to work on in the near future. We can all take individually, take a look at the charter, and send any notes to the list as to issues that we might see or things that we might raise, and then we can decide from there about having another call to discuss them or how best to proceed.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Karen. That's correct. We have no pending selection processes at a time, and we have no call scheduled at this time. So we'll take an action item to circulate the charter and ask folks to review it and notify us if they think there's anything they would like to see addressed and bring up for discussion.

