
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Standing Selection Committee

Wednesday, 25 January 2023 at 13:30 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/cACjDQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee call on Wednesday 25th of January at 13:30 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call, and attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. We received no apologies for today's call.

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recording will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please do remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply the expected standards of behavior. Thank you so much, and over to you, Arinola, please begin.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you so much, Nathalie. This is Arinola for the transcript. I want to welcome everybody to this meeting today, the 25th day of

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.

January 2023. Okay. I'm hoping that we'll have a very engaging time together once again as always. And I would like to ask if anybody has any updates to their SOIs so that we get that out of the way and get to the business of the day. Any updates to the SOIs?

Okay. Seeing no hands, we'll move to item number two on the agenda, which is the business of the day. That is the selection process for the GNSO nominated fellowship selection committee member. I would be, at this point, be handing over to the org to walk us through the review of the poll results. Over to you, org.

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Arinola. Hi, everyone. This is Emily from ICANN org. So hopefully, you've all had a chance to take a look at the poll results. I'll share them here if you'd like to follow along. So we got seven responses, which is good. There are nine SSC members who participate in consensus calls. So higher numbers than the last time. I will note that you can see here that it says ten started the poll and seven completed.

So if there's anyone who started the poll and wasn't able to complete it, or was having trouble and you don't see your name here, please just make sure that you provide a contribution on the call or by email after the call if you're listening to this recording later. So just to make sure that everyone's perspectives are captured if someone was having a technical difficulty.

So we'll just briefly go through as we did on the last one. The responses that we received, and then there will be time to discuss

further. The first question is as to whether each of the candidates meets the skills and experience in the expression of interest and the desired attributes. So, hopefully, this is familiar to all of you, but the skills and experience we're looking at is an active participant in GNSO structures and policy development processes for at least two years with a track record of engagement.

Also desirable as experience in cross community working groups at ICANN, a track record of being an active contributor during ICANN meetings, and experience with specific sectors of the ICANN ecosystem listed here so that they can evaluate candidates answered in the ICANN context. And then the attributes. A member of a stakeholder group or constituency and willingness to put the necessary time.

So you'll see that everyone who responded to the poll felt that Mike Rosenbaum had met these criteria. For Peter, it was a bit more of a mix and perhaps that's an opportunity to discuss for those who either answered no or don't know why they did so. And for Tim, again, here a little bit of a mix. So five responses that he did meet the criteria and one no and one don't know. So again, potentially, an opportunity to discuss especially in the cases of don't know what information might be missing that would enable them to make that assessment.

So we have some comments here and hopefully people will be able to speak to them, and I won't try to summarize at the risk of summarizing incorrectly or not fully capturing the comments, but we'll come back to these so that people can speak to each of them, again, here for Peter and for Tim. And then this is the overall assessment. Again, this is so for each respondent, they

ranked the candidates one, two, or three, and this is the average score of the responses.

So again, this is not authoritative. This doesn't include everyone's answers, but it just gives a general sense of the mix of the rankings for those who did respond to the poll for the purposes of discussion. If there are any questions about the poll, I'm happy to try to answer them. But otherwise, perhaps we can launch into discussion. And for that, I will pass it back to the Arinola. Thanks.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Thank you, Emily. That's quite interesting to see the poll results. I believe we've all had the opportunity to assess it and to read through. Right now, what we'll be doing will be to discuss the candidates and our concerns, our reasons for certain decisions so that we can all come up with a consensus candidate. My observation is that we all agree that all the candidates do not have any involvement with the fellowship program from what I have seen there.

However, it is interesting to me, personally, to note that we all agree that hundred percent, the percentage difference. And then at the end of the poll Peter comes top on the table. So for those of us who have concerns, I will throw the floor open so that we can actually engage ourselves and understand how it goes. So the floor is open for anyone who would like to chip in anything. Emily, you have your hands up.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Arinola. This is Emily from ICANN org. So Arsene asked a question in the chat about understanding what this chart means. And what it's showing is just a summary of the responses to the final question of the poll, which is the ranking question. And this is an auto generated by the survey tool chart.

But my understanding of what it's showing is that, if let's say, four people responded to this poll and everybody put Peter first, the average of the scores. So the score of one because he was ranked first, times four, divided by four, would be one. So if everybody answered that he was number one, he would have a score of one average. So that's just to give you a set. Yeah, exactly as Sam is saying. It's an unweighted average of the rankings.

So of the seven responses, it's showing you if you add up the scores for each of these candidates and the ranking, and then divide by the number of responses, that's what the average is here. And actually, if you look at, I was looking at the responses in terms of how people scored their first choice. There isn't a single theme there. So we have, let's see, one, two, three people put Peter first as number one, two put Tim first, and two put Mike first. So there's a split in terms of people's first choices. But what this is showing is that average. So again, it's not definitive. It's just to give sort of a feel for what people were thinking as they were responding to this.

I think perhaps more telling is the evaluator's comments and observations because they really speak to some of the specific thoughts and concerns that people have with respect to the criteria that need to be used to evaluate the candidates, which are

these here. These specific skills, and experience, and desired attributes. So hopefully, that is helpful. And maybe I'll just leave it here so that people can have this in the back of their minds as well. Thanks.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Emily. Okay. So Alan you go.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Arinola. And thank you, Emily as well. I suppose I'm happy to kind of chime in on my thoughts in this one. Number one, I think we should definitely say that all three candidates definitely are great candidates to be picking from. But the way that I personally approached this was specifically again as I like to do is looking at directing skills and experience and trying to figure out the most relevance to the role at hand and out of this course, choosing those people for the fellowship, specifically, to partaken.

So when I was looking at this, from my work personal opinion and point of view, I thought that there was a definite throw up between the wealth of ICANN experience, but also the importance of the representation of the underserved and underrepresented communities that are very much core to the fellowship program and to the choice of the candidate within that program. The understanding of that.

So based on that alone, I did feel that one candidate obviously did fit that bill a little bit closer when it came to the underserved representatives. And that is where my vote went. But that being

said, I also think that there is a wealth of importance in the ICANN experience, but I felt that given that the feeling of the fellowship and what the fellowship should be about, I did with, and I'll be direct, I thought he was closer to being able to serve in that role as objectively and with some very important background information. That would be what I thought.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Thank you, Alan. Would anyone like to also give us your own perspective too? Any other person? Yeah, I tend to agree with you Alan on giving consideration to someone from the underserved and underrepresented region for these roles as it will be closer to the desires of the fellowship program as much as would also want to put into consideration the experience of that person within the ICANN ecosystem.

Personally, for me, I did give consideration mostly to, also apart from the underserved and underrepresented region, I did consider your experience in candidate evaluation process. It could actually be in the process of the human resource. It could actually be. But looking at it all, and I think, for me, it was a tough decision between Tim and Peter because the Board have that experience of candidate evaluation. But that was it for me. Okay, Sam, you can go, please.

SAM LANFRANCO:

Okay. Thank you. Sam Lanfranco for the record. First, a little preamble before I say what I'm going to say. I belong to two organizations, one, an NGO in Africa, and the other, an NGO in

India. So I'm very comfortable with being the minority member of anything because I'm usually the only one there from my particular constituency.

Having said that, I too ranked Peter first, but mainly for the breadth of his capacity, not just representing an area that's frequently underrepresented, but I think I like the breadth of his capacity. I ranked them the way they're ranked overall. It was very close. But for me, it wasn't country of residence. It was basically for the task at hand who's probably going to be more flexible. And that's why I ranked them as I did. Thank you.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Do we have any other person who would like to chime in something? Okay, we don't seem to have much contributions this time around. So I might need to move to ask a question to find out if we are comfortable with the ranking. Can you please, Emily, slide to the ranking page?

Okay. Now that I think three out of the seven commenters I've spoken, and I guess others are fine, and we're all good with Peter. Okay. Thank you very much, Anne, for that. Thank you, Arsene. Your support goes to Peter too. Okay. Thank you, Arsene. That is noted, well noted. Good. So that means I would write this submission from everyone to conclude that for those of us on the call, we are agreeing to put the name of Taiwo Peter Akinremi forward.

If I am correct, can you kindly indicate in the chat? Okay. Thank you very much, Sam. Thank you very much, Alan. All right. Oh,

beautiful. Thank you, Christian. Okay. So Emily would need to send out a mail to the mailing lists so that we'll have full consensus to put forward the name of Taiwo Peter Akinremi as the GNSO nominated fellowship selection committee member.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Arinola. This is Emily. May I ask just one follow-up question?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Okay, please. Go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: It's 48 hours just noting that it looks like from those who are on the call, there is agreement, but we want to, of course, provide an opportunity for those not on the call to weigh in on the mailing list. Is 48 hours sufficient to wrap up that process from the perspective of this group? That's typically what we do.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yes. I would think so.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think so. In this case.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: 48 hours is fair enough.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Thanks for confirming.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Okay. And now that we got the item number two sorted out, yeah, it's a wrap. So thanks, Arsene. We move to item number 3, which is AOB. Do we have any other business? Okay. I think I have one item I would like to raise with us. I listened to the last call that I had to request my cell phone. And I did observe that some observations, suggestions we're made in terms of improvement, which has to do with, I think it was Stephany that made the suggestion for an alternate candidate to also be put forward should the primary candidate not be able to serve.

Well, for me, I believe our scope is tailored and forecast based on our, how do I put this one? Our [00:20:42 -inaudible] the Council. Our duty is to work on getting a candidate put forward to the Council. Perhaps we could suggest to the Council to do something in future with regards to that. As in, it could be a process name, as in, like, right now, we have our candidates rated one, two, three. Maybe the first three will be there. And then if for per chance, I've seen a situation where I think it's the ALAC or so, if I am correct, the nominated mentor could serve only just one ICANN meeting, and another person replaced to serve the other two ICANN meetings.

We could actually suggest to the Council for their ratification for us to put that person, like, a placeholder candidate so that if per venture the primary candidate cannot go forward then there would be no need to go through a fresh selection process. Rather, we'll

just pick up the second person. That's what I thought about that.
So I hope we're clear on that.

ALAN WOODS: I might just jump in there.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much. So yes. And thank you for reminding me about that conversation that was had. And indeed, I suppose from my point of view, I would probably let that-- my question is, and probably staff will be better able to advice on this one. With regards to the charter, I'm just wondering whether or not that is something that was in. Are we in a position and are we empowered to suggest improvements to the GNSO? Or as a matter of kind of course, noting that Greg is here as the GNSO representative, that that could be something that is just taken into account when next selection processes come up.

And that it can be said that there was some note at the last SSC selections that perhaps an option of an alternate in case of alternate circumstances is wanting. And that can be raised when the next election process is established by the GNSO, but that can be a consideration of the Council as opposed to us making any formal request in that sense. Just in case we go some [00:23:57 - inaudible] roots that we don't want to put ourselves in the corner. But I think we can still get the message across nicely by just

having the representation here. Might be enough. I'm just putting another option out there.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Alan. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Arinola. And Alan, thanks for the question. This is Emily from staff. So I think it's sort of an interesting question because it's both a question for Council and also potentially a matter of the specific appointment to which the SSC is making a selection. So in this case the fellowship program has its own sort of structure and rules and requirements and so forth in terms of who participates in these different rules within the program. And you could imagine that a review team, for example, might have its own set of policies and rules for alternates or substitutes or someone's stepping in if another person needs to step out. Right?

So I don't know if you can have one blanket. And Council doesn't necessarily dictate those things. Right? So Council may be invited to select a candidate for a particular role, but it may be outside of the remit of Council to dictate substitutions or membership changes or those kinds of things. So I think that's sort of the first point.

On the specific issue of the fellowship program. And I think in this case, it was a question about the fellowship mentor program. I think the question and maybe we can clarify a little bit if it's a matter of someone gets sick and they're not able to serve for a single meeting. You know, is the question, can there be a

substitute, or is the question if a mentor needs a step down halfway through their term, can the GNSO appoint someone to fill that spot? I think those are two potentially different things? Or is there another circumstance that the SSC is envisioning? And from a process perspective, things that are really about-- the group is very much focused on selection. That is the key role of the SSC. But this is a recommendation to some extent about selection.

So I think clarifying specifically what the SSC, you know, what circumstances the SSC is interested in addressing, I think, is the first thing. I think the second thing is if the SSC says, hey, and what we can do from the staff side is to clarify if there already is a process or procedure in place with the fellowship program for those circumstances. And if there isn't, I think the SSC could tell Council who could then potentially relate to the fellowship program that there is a suggestion from the SSC. I think that is possible. So I hope that that's helpful.

And I'm sorry to make it complicated, but I think we just need to clarify a little bit what we're trying to achieve for the specific circumstance and get clarification about whether it's already addressed and then figure out the channel for communicating that. Thanks.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Emily. Sam, please go ahead. I see your hand up.

SAM LANFRANCO: Okay. Thank you. Sam, for the record. Yeah, I agree with what Emily has just said, but I would say that what we could do is frame the issue, the issue being what happens if somebody who has taken a position that they've been nominated to it, for some reason can't continue, whether we call that an alternate, or a substitute, or a backup.

I think that discussion probably should happen just to see what the practices are across ICANN. And then to be at some level in ICANN that a decision on how to deal with that is addressed rather than asking for a one off here. Just let them deal with the question and decide where it should be handled. Let Council get the question and decide where it should be handled. Thank you.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Thank you, Sam. Okay. As from my own understanding, I haven't read through the fellowship program mentoring process. If there are conditions wherein if your mentor cannot continue with the process, the GNSO is expected to replace that mentor. I'm just using the mentor as a yardstick. But any representative that goes from the GNSO that is appointed by the GNSO is expected to be replaced by the GNSO. Like I told you this, an example, I think it was the first, the very first mentoring process at the fellowship. I think it should be ALAC. Just one meeting and then somebody else had to take over the other two meetings.

A situation could come up wherein the primary nominated person will not be able to continue. It could actually be for [00:29:57 - inaudible] like Emily mentioned. It could also be for negative comments on the part of the mentees. That is also possible. And

it will go back to the Council to appoint someone else, which automatically means it rolls back to the SSC. That is why I felt it was something we could explore. With the Council liaising with us would explore that the last or he could also share his opinion with us. Greg? Greg, please go ahead.

GREGORY DIBIASE: So I'm slightly confused. Are we talking about a process to always have an alternate in addition to our main choice? Because I guess my inclination there would be this is such a narrow issue that adding a process may seem more cumbersome than simply going back to the SSC and adding an agenda item to go look at the recording and have the SSC decide on who the backup should be. Does that make sense?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: I didn't actually get you Greg. Could you run over that again?

GREGORY DIBIASE: So I guess I'm slightly confused on what the question is right now. As the question is, should the process be to always choose an alternate as well as the main selection.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: I'm thinking, yeah, that is what I thought. But Anne, let's have. Emily, please. Emily first. Emily, please go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks everyone. This is Emily from staff. So maybe a suggestion. So it sounds like the SSC is looking for guidance from Council about whether it would be helpful to either in some cases have an alternate or a replacement candidate should the person step down and the replacement candidate is still available. And since each process is probably different, and each role is probably different, and the landscape is probably different.

Perhaps this could just be an item of feedback to the SSC to Council requesting that for future SSC assignments if it is useful from the Council perspective for the SSC to identify either a temporary alternate who could step in or someone who might be able to step up and replace if a member needed to step away. If it's helpful for the SSC to identify such a person sort of a second choice, the Council will specify that in their assignments to the SSC. And that way, it's on Council and staff to determine if such a thing is appropriate and can be accommodated in the context of whatever the role is. And the SSC will have clear guidance and an opportunity where appropriate to make those additional nuanced recommendations. Thanks.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Thank you, Emily, for that wonderful input. Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Yeah, I agree with Emily that it's appropriate for Council to consider at the time that they're providing the assignment to us, the possibility that an alternate be designated, I would say, under

the circumstances that the selected candidate is unable to serve out his or her term. So I would probably say that when Council is considering that they should look at not just, like an instance of being sick and being able to come to a meeting or whatever, but more so, being unable to serve out the term of the appointment.

And I think it's a good idea for Council to come consider that when making the assignment to SSC. Because I think that if the first candidate for whatever reason is not able to serve out the term, I don't think that you could just go back to the old recording and take the next one. Procedurally, I think you would have to open it up again to candidates to be considered for what is at that point in time an open position.

So in terms of efficiency, it does make sense to me what Emily says about having Council consider in light of all the rules that might apply that staff has to advise Council about at the time that the assignment is made, because I agree with Emily about review teams, etc. But if Council could consider that when making the assignment to SSC you know, definitely agree with the recommendation that having an alternate place is a good practice where it's not governed by the other rules already in place for the particular position to be filled. Thanks. I hope that wasn't just, I'm just running on. Sorry.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: That was good, Anne. Yeah, you captured it appropriately. Alan, please?

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much. No. I was actually I had my hand up, and then Anne started talking. And I really do plus one to Anne. I'm a bit of a stickler for when it comes to specifying the ICANN context where we are given specific instructions, we are to follow the instructions. And I do appreciate staff's input there saying that as a moment of feedback, I think that's fair.

But remember, we are a selection committee first and foremost, and it's not up to us to suggest improvements to the selection process where there are too, sorry, the instructions, we're there to select based on the instructions we receive. So as feedback, absolutely. But I really do think as was put there by Emily, that it is very much a creature of the position that is being asked to consider and circumstances. I just I want us to stay, to be blunt about it, to stay in our in our lane, and not push outside that. I think we need to be very careful that there's not [00:37:11 - inaudible] here.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Thank you, everybody. So we agree that we should have it as a feedback to the Council for it should be considered. While they're assigning our task to us, they could put this into consideration so that it doesn't make it cumbersome for us to keep going back or starting the process of fresh, but we would know we have a backup candidate.

All right. Yes, Greg, Emily will work with you to put the right feedback forward to the Council. Thank you for taking that up on our behalf. I think we're past the hour now and wouldn't want to

take much of everybody's time. Thank you all for staying on. And do we have any other thing, Emily?

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Arinola. This is Emily. So I think our action item here is for Greg and staff to go back and just make sure that the feedback is provided to Council, and I'll just summarize here and perhaps put in an email after this call as well for everyone to make sure that we are in fact bringing it forward correctly, which is that the SSC would find it helpful in receiving its future assignments to know if the SSC should be selecting just a single candidate or should be also potentially naming a candidate who might be able to step in to finish a term should the candidate not be able to complete the term themselves.

So I think that's what we were hearing. If that's incorrect, please let us know and we'll put it in an email to the SSC as well just in case folks want to take a look at that before we bring it forward to Council. Thanks very much.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI:

Thank you. Thank you so much, Emily. I think that will be really nice if you can put it on the mailing list, so we'll look through it. And we're sure we have the right wordings and make sure that everything goes well without wanting to go out of our lane, but ensuring that we do the right thing. So want to thank everyone for your time, for your contributions, and for all that we have done. Thank you so much, and do have good rest of the day.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's as a sequel. Have an excellent rest of your days and evenings, and take care, everybody. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]