

---

**ICANN Transcription**

**GNSO Standing Selection Committee**

**Wednesday, 11 January 2023 at 13:00 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/1QGBDQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee Call on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> January 2023 at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. All documented 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 say 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 this, I will turn it back over to Alan Woods. Please begin.

---

*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.*

---

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, and welcome everybody to this call of the Standing Selection Committee. In particular, welcome to our alternates today. Thank you very much. That's to Glen, to Tim, and to Stephanie Perrin, as we know that Arinola and Arsène are going to be out today because they are two candidates. Therefore, Stephanie and Tim are standing in for both of them today.

So we have a bit of work to do today. That is, we're going to go through, basically—you can see the agenda that—we're going to go through the candidates and try and figure out and come to what is our full consensus, that is the standing expectation from ourselves on the Standing Selection Committee for the Fellowship Program mentor.

Now before we get into that, I'll just do the traditional any updates to the SOI that anybody would like to make before we get into the main?

Okay, not seeing any hands.

TIM SMITH: Hi.

ALAN WOODS: Yep. Go on, Tim.

TIM SMITH: I went in a few days ago and updated my SOI just to add the fact that I have been, for the past few years, a member of the SCBO,

---

GNSO's Standing Committee on Budget & Operations. So it's really nothing new, but I did update it.

ALAN WOODS:

Fair enough. Thank you very much, Tim. I'm assuming nobody has any objections to that. But just in case, speak now or forever hold your peace, as they say. But beyond that, thank you very much, Tim. I do appreciate that. That was noted.

Okay, so with that we're going to move on to #2 then on the selection process. So as you well know [inaudible] probably, Emily, you'll go through this. But we did have our poll out the poll only got five responses at the end of the day. So there's a few members that are certainly unfortunately missing from the poll. But Emily will go through this. It's not that the poll is to help in the discussion, to help in the decision. It is not determinant of the decision itself.

So I will pass it back over to whomever from staff wants to take on this, and they will take us through the results of that poll to help focus us in our discussion today.

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Alan. I'm happy to do that. And hi, everyone. Happy new year to you all. So I'll start by just resharing so that it's on hand, both the poll results and the Wiki page, which hopefully you're all familiar with at this stage. But it's nice to have it on hand for this discussion as well.

---

As you all know, at this point we had a healthy pool of applicants for this position. So there were a total of seven. And, gain, as Alan said, the purpose of the poll, which we do for every SSC process, is really to encourage everyone and remind everyone, first of all, to review the application materials carefully before the call. Important for a full discussion. And also just to help everyone organize their thoughts a little bit and have some of those reflections in one place for folks to look at.

As Alan mentioned in this particular case, less than half of the SSC members replied to the poll. So, indeed, this is not going to be something that you can just look at and take at face value. It's really just to feed into the conversation here today because we have a bigger group on the call, and others may weigh in as well over the e-mail list after the call.

So I think what I'll do here is just very briefly show you, if you hadn't had a chance to look at it, what we got in terms of the poll results. The first question of substance is about whether those who responded—again, only five people—felt that the candidates met the requirements or criteria for the position. And you'll recall that those criteria came straight from the EOI itself.

So Hago Dafalla. We had, you can see here, four responded that they felt that he met these criteria. Lia, a little bit less, more of a mix. Shah, also a bit of a mix from those who did respond. Arsène, from those who responded there was quite a bit of confidence that he met the requirements. Same for Arinola. Pascal, perhaps a little less or some uncertainly by at least one person. And Christopher, it seemed like there was perhaps less of a sense that he met those criteria.

---

So, again, this is not prescriptive but just to give a sense of the responses that we received so far. And let me just go back. These are the folks who responded. So we have responses from ... And this is not to call anyone out, but just to give you a sense of who came in with these responses. It's Sam, Tim, Anne, Brian, and Alan.

So I don't want to speak for anyone in terms of their comments. Hopefully, this is something that you all can speak to. And when we talk about individual candidates, we can certainly bring these comments up as well. But those who did fill out the poll did weigh in and reflect on some of those candidates. And perhaps we can focus in on some of the candidates that seem to be more closely aligned with the criteria when we come back to this. In particular, it looks like there's very strong confidence from those who responded that Arsène and Arinola meet those criteria. So those could be potential areas of focus.

And then the last thing I wanted to touch on was this ranking. Again, only five responses, so really just an initial indicator but it might help us think a little bit about where we focus the discussion in terms of candidates. And this ranking is weighted by the survey application. So, again, this is not an exact science but just to get the conversation started.

I did notice that in some of the substantive comments, there were references to the importance of diversity over time in terms of the mentor role, and that that was something that folks might want to take into consideration. So I did want to just list the previous mentors from recent years in case that's useful information for you all to have. And it wasn't on the Wiki page.

---

So the current mentor who was brought in, appointed a year ago, is Chris Disspain from the Registries Stakeholder Group. He's from the UK. The year before that, it was Farell Folly from the NCSG. He's from Benin and lives in Germany. Before that it was Amr Elsadr from the NCSG based in Egypt. And before that, it was Andrew Mack from the BC based in the U.S. So Chris Disspain is the current one from the Registries Stakeholder Group. Before that, two from the NCSG, two years in a row. And then before that, the BC.

So I don't know if there's more, Alan, that you'd like me to deeper dive into the poll results at this stage or if you want to just fire up the conversation and we can dip into some of these comments a little bit more when we get there.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you so much, Emily. That's really helpful. Yes, I think we'll dive in with the conversation. Obviously, when we have such a large number of people [inaudible] the process ... I suppose, from my own personal experience to try to be as impartial as possible, I think the easiest way for us to do would be maybe focus on eliminating some from the lower end of the spectrum based on responses.

So I think the first question we'd ask is, people who have reviewed the information—the applications, the SOIs, and the Expressions of Interest—are there people who have, looking at this in front of us ... And I find this is very helpful.

---

Are there people who would disagree with—basically I'd say 4 down to 7—that these are people who, although we're very happy that they applied, would be not as qualified for this particular role in this particular moment in comparison to the ones that are at the top of the board so that we can focus our conversation on perhaps four upwards or maybe even a smaller group as we go through? Just trying to focus us.

So I think that would be the good starting point. Is there anybody who disagrees with the four that we would perhaps say to eliminate at this point? And I will ask people to, if you do not agree, put your hand up.

Please, Tim. Thank you very much. Go on ahead.

TIM SMITH: Actually, I don't disagree. I agree with this.

ALAN WOODS: Okay.

TIM SMITH: I was actually quite amazed that it seemed to rank that way. So I think that states something for the five people who did contribute to the poll.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Tim. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. And I'm sorry I'm a late edition to this process, but I'm just wondering if ... When folks evaluated, are they relying entirely on what was put in the application or are we to rely at all on personal experience of the folks that have applied? I'm struck by the list of people who've had this role. Frankly, there can be no comparison between the experience of, say, Chris Disspain or Amr Elsadr and the folks who have applied, in my opinion. But that's just an opinion.

And I'm just wondering how you made the ranking. Was it based on the applicant's own testimony? And were there references that people had a look at?

ALAN WOODS: I'm more than happy to give my input. But thank you very much to, I think it was, Devan ... Oh, no. Emily went back to, basically, the objective skill points. So from my point of view, as I do not know most of these people myself, I did go solely off of the skills requirements, applying the skills requirements that are listed for this particular role, and the specific questions that are asked on the EOI which, of course, speak directly to asking the questions of skills and experience, the mentorship, the experience within the GNSO processes, etc.

So from my point of view, yes, I tried to be as objective as possible based on that which was presented within the application itself, and literally going through the list and trying to take off of what was there. So that was my take on it.



---

I see we've got a little bit of a queue forming, so I will go straight to Anne, please, first. And then over to Emily.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you, Alan. And thank you, Stephanie. I don't know these people either, and so I had gone strictly by the Expressions of Interest and also the SOIs that were linked in all of the materials. So one of the things that I was looking for, Stephanie, is actual participation in working groups because I feel as though, in the mentoring position, one of the important things is to encourage Fellows to actually participate in policy processes. And so I weighted heavily the applicants' prior experience in working groups and active participate in that. And that was the reason for my rankings. Thank you.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Anne. Emily, over to you, please.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Alan. This is a bit of a more general comment from the staff side. So Stephanie, in the poll itself, as I highlighted there, I think bringing your own experience into this discussion is certainly welcome. Of course, for some SSC members, they may not be familiar with some candidates and so they're then relying, as Alan and Anne noted, on the materials provided. But if you have a personal experience that you think is relevant to the discussion, that's certainly welcome.

---

And of course, also, as representatives of your group to the extent that groups are bringing or have input, they can channel that through you as well on the candidates. So it's certainly not exclusive to the materials, but to the extent that there's not personal familiarity or input from the groups you represent, then the application materials are sort of the core of what you have left to rely on. I hope that helps. Thanks.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much, Emily. And I suppose one other thing I'll add, being one of the lawyers ... I'm sure Stephanie is ... [inaudible] lawyer approach in things. But going back to the Charter as well, just to echo what Emily has said there, that it does specifically say we are to "collectively review as members of the SSC, the applications and all materials relevant to the selection."

So if you have those additional elements that can be provided from personal experience, well then that is what this call is definitely for so that we can discuss each individual candidate. And if you feel [that they've] gotten an unfair doing in the actual review, then absolutely that should be brought to the table to be discussed.

Stephanie, did you have any follow-up on that? Does that answer your questions? Or where are we on that?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Hi. Thanks for the follow up. Certainly, it answers my questions. I do feel we have a wonderful tool now that we just found out about

---

from ... [Neil] [inaudible] and his crew have come up with a word analysis tool that works on all of the e-mails that ICANN has. So we could actually apply it over the e-mails of the working groups that folks say they have participated in and find out just what kind of participation there was.

Sadly, I did not do that work over the weekend. So I do apologize. But that's one way of checking attestations that's going to be pretty authoritative in the future. Thank you.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much, Stephanie. Again, I wasn't aware of that particular tool, but that sounds like a great tool to be able to use for those.

So with that, I would just re-ask the question, then. Given the impression that's give then by the poll at the moment, however, are we disagreed that the top three candidates, however, would be Arinola, Arsène, and Pascal at the moment? Okay, not seeing anybody jumping to put their hands up. There is an agreement on that. Excellent. Thank you very much, all.

So, obviously, let the record be shown that we are exceptionally appreciative of the time and the effort that it's taken to put these applications in. But for now, we will focus then on the top three from this particular representative poll. And that is Arinola, Arsène, and Pascal.

So I think at this point, the most prudent way to do it would be to ask people, of these three ... In the committee, I would ask for people to say who in their estimation would they prefer. Who

---

would they think would be the best to perform the role of the mentor, given the applications that we have all reviewed?

Obviously in the place of chair, I will defer to everybody first. And I'm happy, if there is any disparity of discussions, I'll chime in at the end. But I'm happy to defer to somebody else to start that conversation. So I'll ask volunteers to lead that, please.

Anne, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Alan, I raised my hand in order to ask a clarifying question and not actually to lead [inaudible].

ALAN WOODS: Sure.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: But I would like to understand a little bit better about these other average notes to the right of the ranking. Do I understand that in the rankings that, for example, Candidate 1 ... That Candidate 1's average rank at 1.6 means that most of the respondents ranked her as 1 and then ... If somebody could help me with these AVG, these average calculations, so that I don't just assume that I know what they mean. Thank you.

ALAN WOODS: Absolutely. Thank you. I'll pass it over to Emily straightaway. Thank you very much, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Alan. As I said, this is something that was automatically generated by the survey tool, so I'd have to dig into exactly what the calculation is. And I don't want to guess, to be completely honest. I think that there must be a numerical value assigned to each ranked ... Yeah, as Sam said it. I think my best guess is that the numerical values is essentially like the average of the scores that were provided by the five people who responded. So you can see that there are five blocks for each of these bars and a color for each block, which I'm guessing corresponds to the ranking.

But what I'm going to do in the background as the discussion starts is see if I can dig that up from the survey tools Help menu. But as I said before, this is really not prescriptive, and these numbers only reflect a general sense of what's come in from a limited number of people. So I'd really hesitate to rely ... Even once we know what the algorithm is, I'd hesitate to rely on that for anything authoritative. But let me go in the background and dig and see if I can figure out exactly what that number means. Thanks.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay. Just quickly, Emily. Thank you. I think I can tell from that. So, for example, it would be three people are agreeing in Candidate #1. So they do kind of correspond based on those color blocks. And I didn't understand those either, so I really appreciate it. Thank you.

---

ALAN WOODS:

No problem. And thank you very much for that question as well. Also, just in case people didn't actually see the question that was asked for this particular one, was the rank. So you put in your 1, your 2, your 3, and so on down. So I think it's just a very much a simple mathematical representation of that.

But again, it is purely, I think, we do need to focus ... This was as an aid to focus our conversation in the time we have as opposed to, you know, Arinola's coming out in front, therefore we choose Arinola.

So, look. With that, I think if somebody doesn't want to actually express their viewpoints on this one, I'm more than happy to kick up the conversation, to step out of chair role and just say how I thought about this at the time. So I'm more than happy to say that, in my estimation, it really came down to between Arsène and Arinola. I was actually probably going ...

I can easily say that I ranked Arsène actually above Arinola just purely because of the experience on the GNSO Council. And I thought that exceptionally relevant to mentees, and I thought that exceptionally relevant to the role of the mentor and the ability to bring people through and into this process which, as we all know, is a very interesting and broad process to be become an expert in.

That being noted, however, I was splitting hairs. I felt that both Arinola and Arsène were clear frontrunners for this position. I thought they would both do an excellent job in this position. And noting and reading, actually, the responses from other people, I would have no problem in saying that if it was Arinola, I would be

---

more than happy to say I'd be happy to change it to Arinola and absolutely support her candidacy for that.

So that was my point. Stepping back into chair, I will open the queue now, having kicked that off, and say over to you, Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. Just one question in relation to that. Did we summarize that the last four Fellowship mentors were male?

ALAN WOODS: We did not.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Did we say Chris, Amr ... I'm sorry. If I could hear those again.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Anne. It's Chris, Farell, Amr, and Andrew. All male. Thanks.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay. I partly would like to encourage consideration of a female candidate in this role, other considerations being equal. Thank you.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Anne. And I completely agree. I think that is definitely something we should take into account on that one.

---

I note Tim also said, "I also ranked Arsène slightly ahead of Arinola because of GNSO Council. Network beyond one's own constituency seems important." And Stephanie is agreeing with Anne on this one saying, "NCSG had two reps lately. It would be rather unfair if we had a rep in this position so soon again." So I appreciate those inputs.

And Christian, that's a plus one I'm assuming to Anne's input. Is it? Christ? Sorry, Christian. Not Chris. Good Lord. Apologies.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Yes. Christian agreeing with Anne's [inaudible].

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much. Okay. So we've got a few inputs on that one. Tim, can I ask a direct question? Because I'm just trying to facilitate the conversation now. Based on that particular input, the NCSG's viewpoints and the gender balance viewpoint, would you have any objection to ranking Arinola higher at this point or would you stick to your guns on that?

TIM SMITH: No. I quite agree with the diversity or the gender alignment, however you want to refer to it. I completely support that.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much. Sorry, the way I do these things is very [kind of] straightforward. So I'm building up a case here like a



---

goddamn lawyer. Apologies. So over to you, Sam, please. Thank you very much.

SAM LANFRANCO: Okay, thank you. Can you hear me?

ALAN WOODS: We can take, indeed. Thank you. Yeah.

SAM LANFRANCO: Okay. I had ranked them in that order, and I was also concerned about gender based on the history of the position. But I'm also pleased that both of them are from Africa.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Sam. Yes, absolutely agreed. And I think ... Just to correct what I'm saying, I think it's a diversity scale as opposed to specifically naming any one of those particular strands. So I completely agree from a diversity scale. Thank you. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. I just want to chime in to agree with those comments. I also want to state that I feel that each of the men that have served previously was extremely well qualified, and I don't want the comment to be interpreted as a comment on how they performed their duties or whatever. It is just a comment related to promoting diversity. And I'm kind of wondering ...

---

And I actually I also love the fact that our top two candidates here are from Africa.

Is there any sort of practice of naming an alternate if the first selection is unable to serve or has any issues? Or do we simply note our choice? Thank you.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much. I don't know the exact answer to that, but I would assume that it refers to our instructions received from Council. So therefore, I will defer to Emily first. And Sam, maybe I will just let Emily jump in first. And then go back to, Sam, if that's okay.

SAM LANFRANCO:

Yes.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Alan. And thanks, Anne, for the question. So for this particular role, just going back to the resolutions from previous years, just a single candidate has been put forward. But I think you could certainly say in your recommendation to Council and request that that's included, that essentially person one is the recommended candidate, but to the extent that person needs to step down or whatever else, the SSC also considers person two be highly qualified and an excellent candidate to step into the role, or something like that. I don't think that there's anything that would stop you from doing that.

---

But I do think you want to try to put forward a single candidate as a recommended person to fill the slot by the deadline. Thanks.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Emily. I'll go to Sam and then I'll put you back in queue. Thank you.

SAM LANFRANCO: Okay, thank you. Another consideration for me is that mentorship, unlike a technical position is also a role model. And I think it's important that we have diversity in the role models over time.

ALAN WOODS: Absolutely agreed as well, Sam. Thank you very much. Anne, do you want to come back then?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Just possibly to suggest that we could state that in the event that our first choice is unable to serve, that ... Kind of what Emily said, but I don't ... I'm only saying that because I do think it's good to be encouraging to folks who have made the effort to apply. And I don't know if there's a way that we could sort of congratulate Arsène by saying something about "an alternate if unable to serve."

ALAN WOODS: [Appreciate that].

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: But I think it might be nice, if others agree [inaudible].

ALAN WOODS: Thank you, Anne. Yeah. I'm definitely not going to do this to Greg. I'm [not going to put him on the spot], but I do think it's something we should consider from ... Would that be acceptable to the GNSO Council? Maybe it's a question we can raise with them informally or formally. But as a member as opposed to chair, for the record, I would have no problem with noting that, and actually it probably would make sense given the world at this point, there might be a need for a secondary at some point.

But I would really defer to probably the GNSO Council's instructions on this one, per our Charter. So, Greg, if you want to, if you have an opinion on this at the moment, please feel free. But if not, we can always backchannel with you on that.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah. I have a personal opinion that makes sense, and I agree with Anne. I don't know if there's a relevant rule. I wouldn't think there is. I think that would be okay, but maybe we can follow up off list. Maybe Emily knows.

ALAN WOODS: Sure. We can do that.

---

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Greg. My recollection is that there ... And we can check it after the call. But my recollection is that there's not anything that prohibits something additional in terms of commentary in the resolution or something that Greg could also say verbally [inaudible] ... It's a consent agenda item, so it's not going to go up for discussion. But it could also potentially be something that's sort of stated verbally if that seems more appropriate.

I think it's fine for the SSC to provide some nuance in their recommendation, especially given that you need to reach full consensus. So I do know, in the past, some SSC recommendations have noted, for example, that they selected one candidate but found that there were other qualified candidates for the role. I don't remember a case where one additional candidate was called out as also being exceptionally qualified. So I don't know if that is something that the group wants to do to sort of say Arsène is definitely also a great choice, but not everybody else. That's sort of a decision for all of you to think about.

But in terms of the content of your recommendation, if you do want to add some color and nuance, as long as it's clear who your first choice is for filling the role so that Council can indeed vote on that, I think that it should be acceptable if not purely in the instructions [to do so]. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Yeah. I'm happy to make a note during the consent agenda to that effect, that there was another highly-skilled candidate or ... We can figure out the exact wording. But, yeah, I'm happy to mention something as part of the consent agenda.

---

ALAN WOODS:                   Lovely. Thank you, Greg. Thank you, Emily. Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:        Again, I'm reluctant to really be too forceful in my views here, given that I'm just an alternate. But I'm deeply concerned that the role of the mentor should be, in my opinion, someone who can really explain ICANN to the Fellows and answer questions and discuss what the work is like and try to help people become engaged in the working groups. So I do wonder why, in this selection process, we don't have some kind of a test of knowledge and experience to see whether, in fact, these people have the mentorship skills to be helpful to people.

Because if we're interested in diversity—and certainly in NCSG we are interested in promoting diversity—a group of, shall we say, African mentees, for instance, would be best served by someone from another region who knows ICANN and who is a good mentor rather than someone from their own region.

So in terms of the diversity issue, I think gender is a bit different, but I think ... In fact, it's very different. But I do think that selecting someone from a region who has not been active and could not really explain things to probing questions isn't a solution. Now, a bit late in the game. It's not like you're going to institute some kind of a quiz to test these people. But I'm concerned that none of us appear to know these people very well.

I do know Arsène because I served on Council with him. I think I was even Chair of NCSG at the time. But the others, I'm familiar

---

with the name because they apply for things, but not with having worked with them. And I've been around quite a while now. So unless they come from the deep technical side, which is not GNSO membership per se, I'm surprised that we don't have more folks who are more active on committees. Thanks.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much, Stephanie, for that. I'll go to the queue and we can discuss that in a moment. But good points, definitely. And perhaps future work for the SSC to consider without a shadow of a doubt.

Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. I just wanted to comment that I don't think it makes sense for there to be an informal comment that "Candidate #2 is also extremely well qualified." What I was suggesting was more along the lines of what Glen de Saint Géry said in chat, which is the concept of an alternate. Because I don't think we want to just be making kind of informal, "We liked this person, too" type comments.

I think the only point in actually saying anything about all of that would be to have an alternate in the event that the candidate that we put forward is, for any reason, unable to serve. So, otherwise, I would just go with naming one candidate.

---

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much. And I suppose I [would] agree with ... I understand where you're coming from on that one, but in that particular case I would definitely then look at the instruction that we receive from the GNSO Council. And the GNSO Council has asked us to pick a candidate in that instance. So I think this could be something that we could consider and suggest for future rounds, but ...

And at this point I would suggest we put in something along the lines of, we could potentially do that softer kind of invitation of sorts. But if we need to go off of what we have been asked to achieve, that is to identify the candidate not an alternative.

And just noting Emily there where she says she's not sure the Fellowship Program has a mechanism for mentor alternates. Therefore, again, we're slaves to the process, I think, and the instruction in that instance. So I would be an advocate ... Again, not speaking as Chair. I would be an advocate, as member of the SSC, to stick with the instruction in that instance, then.

Tim, over to you.

TIM SMITH:

Thanks very much. I certainly agree with ... Well, let's not muddy the waters. We've been asked to do a specific thing. Let's do this specific thing. We do have, I would say, three good candidates that sort of rise to the top. But rather than muddying the waters, let's just stick to the one and name the one that we believe their name should be inserted into the motion that will go before the Council.



---

But what I originally raised my hand for was the fact that, within that motion, it also instructs the secretariat to reach out to the candidates to thank them for their interest and to encourage them to apply again. And so what I was going to say was perhaps in that outreach, we could give special mention to Arsène and thank him especially for his contribution and interest.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much, Tim. Now with that, I'm just going to keep an eye on the time here. So we do have 20 minutes left. So I wanted to refocus us back to our goal and our task today, and that is to identify that one candidate.

What Stephanie brought up about future improvements to the program, I think that is something we can definitely talk about. And I think that's something that we can bring back when Arinola comes back in his chair. We can have a chat, and that could be something we place on our future improvements. How do we do this particular process? And I definitely think we can have that discussion.

But I think we can distinguish that today. Unfortunately, as Stephanie said, it's a bit late in the game for this particular process and we have a goal here. So let's focus on that. But I do not want that to go away. I think that we can always talk about improving ourselves. That is something we should always look towards.

So with that, I'm going to cut to the chase with one proviso. And the proviso is—and Emily, please correct me if I'm wrong on this one—but the decision that we come to today is not necessarily the

---

final decision until it goes to the list of all members and, after a reasonable period of time, there is either support unanimously or non-objection. So I just want to make sure that we're not like locking in 100% today. It does go to the list afterwards. Emily, please. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Alan. That's correct. So the SSC makes decisions by full consensus. And Devan will sanity check me here about whether we have the full group here, but I think that we do not have everyone here. So what we want to do here is have sort of a direction of travel from those who are on the call, put that on the mailing list. And then that would go out for a non-objection or any additional comments for ...

I think we typically say 24 hours, but if you wanted to give it more time, that's fine as well. Yeah. But it would be great if, coming out of this call, we could have a name that folks are leaning towards to put out there on the list. Thanks.

ALAN WOODS:

Lovely. Thank you very much, Emily, for that clarification. So noting ... And I welcome David as well. And thank you for joining. [Unfortunately], I don't know if it's ridiculously early or ridiculously late for you, but welcome. Just to bring you up to speed so that we can have the full conversation at the moment, it would appear we eliminated, based on the poll of five members, 4-7.

We are looking purely at Arinola, Arsène, and Pascal. And in fairness to Pascal, we didn't really talk about him but it seems that

---

the conversation went straight to the top two candidates. And if I am not wrong in my estimation—and again, I’m open to correction on this one—I have not heard any objection to Arinola being that one candidate.

So I would ask people now to say whether or not they have any strong objection or an objection, because we’re going for full consensus, for us naming Arinola, based on the discussion, for putting to the list as our preferred candidate [inaudible]. And asking for any comments, any disagreements, and hopefully ending up with that unanimous consensus at the end of the day.

So I will ask people if you have those comments, please speak now.

DAVID CAKE: I have no objection.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, David. Okay. If people feel that I'm not railroading people on this one, then I'm more than happy to say that it would appear that, based on the discussion that we have had today, that Arinola is the top candidate for this and we should proceed with that e-mail. Awesome. Thank you very much, everyone.

Okay, I think that is an important conclusion to come to. So thank you. Emily and staff will now proceed with the next steps for that for us. She did mention there that they normally give 24 hours. Do people believe that 24 hours is enough time for that or do we want

---

to give it just a little bit longer, considering there aren't people who have been able to express their opinions, or not? I'm happy to stay with the 24 hours. Again, not as chair. As a person. But I will leave this, again, to the group if there's any strong objections to 24 hours.

Okay. It seems like 24 ... "Suggests 48 hours." I'm okay with ... I think in the circumstances and that we haven't had the full kind of feedback from people as we would traditionally have, I would agree with 48 hours. So, Emily, if you have no objections to 48 hours, I would ask that that would be put in there. I agree with everybody. Thank you very much. Okay.

So I'm not going to proceed with the additional queries that Stephanie has raised there, but I definitely think that is something we can have a conversation with, specifically because we're going to move on to the next part of the agenda which is for the next selection that we have to go through. And perhaps we might be able to make some improvements or suggested improvements for this next election that is coming up.

So with that, I will now pass it over to Emily. But I will say to everybody, thank you so much for your input today on that. And thank you for getting through this. It's wonderful to get everybody on the same page. So, thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, everyone. I'm sorry for my voice today. So the next selection process ... So just to recap, what we're going to do after this call is send out an e-mail asking everyone if they're okay with this or to

---

Speak up if they have additional comments or objections to the preliminary decision that was made today.

And then after 48 hours, if there's no responses or only positive responses, we'll go ahead and take the next steps which is to ... There's already been a placeholder motion put in which puts us on the Council agenda for this month because there was a deadline at the end of the month we needed to kind of move that piece of it along. But that will enable the leadership team of Council to put that name into the motion, making it official as an SSC recommendation. And then we'll notify the candidates thereafter of the SSC's recommendation. The Council will vote. And then, again, the selected candidate will be notified there as well.

So our next process is also about the Fellowship Program, but it's a different role. It's a little bit confusing because they sound similar, but they are different functions. And you'll recall, we previously discussed that this was another Expression of Interest that was open and recently closed. So they were staggered. This one happened later.

This is specifically for a member of the Selection Committee. So these are people who select the Fellows who participate in the Fellowship Program. So these people are really focused on looking at the Fellowship applications, seeing if the candidates meet the criteria for the Fellowship Program, and selecting those candidates. And there is one person from the GNSO who serves on that committee.

This is the first time the SSC has selected for this role. Previously, it was a member of Council leadership who was who was doing it.

---

Originally, it was Heather Forrest who stepped into the role when she was just leaving Council leadership. She served for some time. She needed to step down from the role, and Sebastian Ducos is now the person in that role from the GNSO Council leadership. But he sort of did it in an interim capacity.

We saw that there was some interest, informally, from different groups in opening up the role and seeing if there were more candidates. The EOI closed on December 9<sup>th</sup>, and there were four applications received. They're included on this Wiki page here for you to see.

So the next question is ... Again, the SSC standard process is to do this poll again to help people organize their thoughts. We've held off on launching the poll because it seems a bit confusing to have two polls happening at once and that might cause confusion, especially since the roles are both related to the Fellowship Program. But I think what we'd like to do ... This one we need to have ...

Coming back to the timeline, the goal is to have a recommendation for the February Council meeting. So that means we have some weeks still until that needs to be a final decision. So what we'd like to propose to do is to finish up this process. So 48 hours from now, we'll go ahead and open the poll for this Selection Committee role.

And what we'd like to do right after this call is to just send you a draft of the poll so you can look at it and tell us if that's fit for purpose for what you want to do. So it's not a live poll at this stage. It's just a preview so that you can look at it and make sure

---

that it makes sense as a though collector. It'll be basically the same as the one that you just did.

So I guess the question is whether that makes sense for all of you. And then we'd put out a Doodle poll and get a get a call scheduled in the second half of January to have a conversation about the candidates.

So pausing there to see if that all makes sense. At that stage, Allen will be no longer our interim chair. Arinola will be back. But since you're all here and on this call, I wanted to run the process by you for next steps. Thanks.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much, Emily. And, no, I'm not giving up power now. Lie by me. Thank you so much.

Yes, I know. Apologies. I probably slightly misspoke there in saying that we could consider the changes before the next election. Of course, I knew this was coming up ridiculously fast on the heels of the other one. But I definitely think we can put it on the long-term considerations for the SSC. And Stephanie's words will definitely be brought to the [floor], the discussions that we have at that point.

So, yes, thank you very much. Again stepping out of the chair's role at the moment, as a member, that makes perfect sense to me. So thank you very much, Emily. Are there any comments, concerns, or queries relating to the upcoming selection process for the Selection Committee?

---

Seeing nothing, that's it. Brilliant. Thank you very much. Yes, please, Emily. If you would proceed as advised, that would be very, very helpful. Thank you.

So then going back to the agenda then, I believe we're just at the last, which is Any Other Business. And does anybody have any other business at this point?

Oh, I'm just noticing there, sorry. Sam said circumstances may require that Sam withdraws his EOI. That is absolutely up to you. So just when you can, great. So that we can invite you into the fold for the discussion as opposed to keeping you outside the door for the [while]. So thank you for that.

Okay, so last call for AOB. Okay, seeing none at the moment then. I just want to, again, express my gratitude to everybody for the time they've taken to review the materials and to come on the call today. And thank you very much for engaging in the process. And a specific shout out to both Tim and Stephanie as well for stepping in. And thank you for the important inputs that you have given in the process today. And I think we definitely will put that task within the SSC in future. Thank you all.

And with that, I think we can end the recording.

DEVAN REED:

Thank you all for joining. Once again, this meeting is adjourned. I'll end the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.



---

ALAN WOODS: Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**