

---

SINGAPORE - 2015 Nominating Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, February 11, 2015 – 11:00 to 12:00  
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Hello. Welcome, everybody. My name is Stephane Van Gelder. I chair the ICANN Nominating Committee. This meeting is the open meeting of the Nominating Committee here in Singapore. For those of you who are not on the Nominating Committee but are in this room or online or following this meeting, welcome, and it's a pleasure to have you and be able to show you some of the work that goes on in the Nominating Committee as part of our drive towards ever-greater transparency. Thanks for that.

We have a very full agenda for our open meeting here, and for the people who want to observe and want to understand how the NomCom works, this will be an interesting session because we'll be going to straight in to some of the mechanics of the work that we do as we prepare to make the best selections possible for the candidates.

What we're going to do is to run through some of the preparatory work that we've been doing through subcommittees. We at the start of the year divided ourselves into various subcommittees, looking at various aspects of our work. These subcommittees have gone away, they've worked hard, and some of them have already come back with some recommendations that we looked at earlier on in the week.

What we wanted to do today was to look at those recommendations again and this time try to determine those recommendations that we thought were useful and that we should keep, and those

---

*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.*

---

recommendations that we thought were probably not quite as useful or needed some more work or needed some more discussion or whatever.

We are going to hear in a minute from the Outreach Subcommittee, and that is Ron, the chair elect of the Nominating Committee this year, who chaired that subcommittee, who will deliver some recommendations and lead us into a discussion on those. Ron will keep the mic for the ARF Application Request Form Subcommittee. Those second subcommittee is looking at improvements to the application request form. It's a very important part of our work, making it as streamlined as possible so that candidates can apply in the best possible conditions.

We'll then hear from Yrjo Lansipuro, working on the Transparency Subcommittee. That committee helps keep us on our toes, basically, to make sure we are as transparent and as informative as we can be about our process, bearing in mind that our usual mantra applies, which is that while the process is open, all candidate data remains private.

Then we'll hear from the Alternate Subcommittee, and that will be the final agenda item of the day. That's a committee that's chaired by Cheryl, the associate chair of this year's NomCom. The idea of that committee is to look at ways in which we can better handle cases where we make a determination, we select a certain pool of candidates, and if one of the candidates that we select for whatever reason isn't able to take office, in that case we are exploring the possibility of having alternates and how we can let the alternates know that they are alternates so that we don't lose people that we've selected to basically stand in in case one of our first choices can't make it.



---

So that's the order of the day. We'll then have a ten-minute wrap up. Without further ado, I'll pass the mic over to Ron for the Outreach Subcommittee report. Ron?

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you, chair. All right, ladies and gentlemen, we passed out to all of you this information, so I'm not going to read through each of the slides. I just would like to point out that the subcommittee on Outreach is made up of Sylvia Herlein Leite, Satish Babu, Brenden Kuerbis, Yrjo Lansipuro, Robert Guerra, and Sarah Deutsch. Fatimata Seye Sylla has also joined us. We're really happy to have you join us and bring your perspectives, Fatimata, from Africa.

As you see, the goals were really – I'll just very briefly touch on these – to leverage the current ICANN activities to outreach and not replicate what they're doing, develop geographic and open positions matrix, prioritize outreach to touch underrepresented regions – as we know, Latin America and South Africa have only three Board members between them, as an example, so we really want to make sure we get to that and get the focus sharpened on those parts of the world – and fine-tune the invitation language to make it more user-friendly to those who are not necessarily English speakers. Next slide, please. Okay. [inaudible] table, I'll take that from my own documentation because my eyes are not quite that good.

The tactics. We looked to ICANN Comms, the Communication Department, to piggyback off of the things they're doing with the social media efforts. As you see, ICANN has some 70,000 Twitter followers, for example. We also are looking at creating Google ads for select sites that



---

match the demographics so that we can do outreach to those parts of the world using proper media, and posting on the Facebook page and so forth.

So the question comes up: who does what and how's that going to work? We had shot a video, for example, yesterday with the leadership team, and that video will then be posted on the ICANN website. These types of activities will be ongoing, so it will be more dynamic than it has been in the past.

We do need to think through the idea of creation of an ad for the committee's review and approval, and that's in the works right now. Hopefully we'll see something on that shortly.

Moving to the next point: use ICANN Comms to create the video. As I mentioned, we did that yesterday. Next point, consider the cost or value of an advertisement in a "The Economist"-type ad. "The Economist" magazine is really an upscale magazine for C-Suite types of executives, and the idea was to look into that.

There are those types of publications in Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and so forth, so we need to look more deeply into that, and we are. The question really needs to come from the committee once we have gotten more input from you, telling us about your regions and where you think those publications are so we could get that data and come back and get some thought to whether we want to pursue that. Next slide, please.

Regarding where we can do our outreach, we've invited all the NomCom members to bring their meetings knowledge to the process,

---

which means that in your regions of the world, meetings that are happening that might be Internet-related that you're aware of we can add to the calendar and make sure that, if not for this year's Nominating Committee, we can offer it to next year's Nominating Committee to make sure that we can get some outreach, whether it's by flyers or whether it's by personal attendance at those things.

But the idea is we need to start reaching out further, so the need here, as is noted, is more information on what I call out-of-the-box regional meetings. That would be maybe for example meeting with the regional Chamber of Commerce meetings, or those types of places where would find leaders in business and in the tech community to invite them to come and put in their applications.

The next point is to continue with the promotional book cards or not. As you know, we've had these bookmarks, and yesterday at our meeting, you wrote the small business cards. We need to consider if these tools are serving us or not, so this is one I'm going to come back to when I finish this presentation.

Create a standalone, 90-second video in multiple languages. I'm going to look to staff to update us on that very quickly. If I may, have we gotten any traction on that yet, Joette?

JOETTE YOUKHANNA:

No.



---

RON ANDRUFF:

Not yet. Okay. The idea here is to really create a piece that could be virtually e-mailed to these types of meetings to say if you could run this before a break or so forth, just to let people know that these are the type of people we're looking for. It would be a very valuable tool. So that's something we're exploring as well.

Enrolling the ICANN CEO to mention the Nominating Committee as he travels around the world to the various meeting, the World Economic Forum, and so forth. That's underway. In fact, he's been active doing that from time to time, so we hope that that also will raise the awareness.

Then review and refine the language used in the invitation and post it prominently on the ICANN website. When I say, "review and refine the language," again, it's to make it user friendly and in language that people globally will understand. I'm very fortunate to have a very broad range of members on this committee, from Africa, Latin America, India, and so forth. I should also mention of course Finland, Yrjo. This is a very broad group of people to look at that and to fine-tune that language.

That's a very rapid run through, but as I said, you received this documentation yesterday. I'd like to open the floor to any and all comments. We don't have to go through this one by one, but I would hope that the committee as a whole would have some thoughts on that.

The floor is open. Don't all rush to the microphones at once. Obviously we're having a technical problem, all those hands going to the mics. What are your general thoughts as a committee as a whole? Obviously we as an outreach committee have tried to put a bunch of thoughts



---

together. We really would like to get some feedback from the committee.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Perhaps I can help out. We don't have to have feedback. If there isn't feedback, we'll just consider that these recommendations are considered approved by the committee. So we can also work that way. We don't have to expect to have a long debate on this if it just makes sense to everybody.

If there isn't – I'll come to you in a minute, John – any discussion to be had on this or that recommendation, then I will in a minute just call for a quick poll to see if everyone's in general approval and we can consider this something we want to go forward with.

John, please.

JOHN LEVINE: I think for the benefit of the non-committee members who might be listening, I think these approaches are fine. I believe the committee members have seen them all already, so I think the lack of discussion is more from familiarity than from bafflement or dislike. I concur with your proposal to accept silence as consent in this particular case.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much. In that case, Ron, all approved. Thank you very much. Next?



---

RON ANDRUFF:

I'll say thanks to the committee for that hard work, and we'll move forward.

The next slide will take us to the NomCom Wiki improvements. If we could just advance to the next slide. The goals were to create a Wiki site that stands apart from the general ICANN Wiki to ensure that there would be absolute security and confidentiality and remove all concerns about any leaks and so forth. In fact that has happened as we had in the last session. We have worked with Ken Bauer. He made that very clear.

We wanted to also simplify the application process to facilitate the ability for both the applicant to put in the information, but also for us to use the site. I'm very grateful that the timing of this follows the training we had this morning, so I think everyone has a sense of just how valuable that works as a tool for the committee.

We wanted also to create an application form that would cut or simplify the steps the staff has to go through to process, and I think that we've been able to do that, and staff are responding very positively to that.

With the dynamic tools we went through this morning to allow the aggregation of your thoughts and information to your private workspace, I hope that you will all report back how you felt about that so that the 2016 NomCom can take advantage of your thoughts in terms of improving this site because I'm sure we'll have another subcommittee on the Wiki for next year.

One of the things that we're doing this year that I think we tried a little bit last year but we're going to press a little more further in this direction this year is we're actually in development of two surveys. The





---

first survey is for all candidates that come to us and fill out an application request form.

Once all the forms are in and we close the application period, then those applicants will get a very nice e-mail from our chair, thanking them for having taken the time and filling all that in. He'll explain what the next steps in the process are, and then he will ask if they would be so kind to fill out a survey to help us to improve the quality of the work we're doing. That will be a survey where we would ask them to give us their names so that if there's anything that we're unclear about or so forth , we can actually go back and get clarification and clarify those points that were unclear for us.

Then we're going to have a second survey for the shortlisted candidates. The shortlisted candidates are those people who are invited to come to our final meeting for interviews. Those interviews, as you will see for the new members of the committee, are very, very intense, and there's a lot of experience that happens in that room over those days. We would like to know from our candidates that come to that if they would be so kind to help us sharpen our ability to hone the skill set for the Nominating Committee to find the right candidates.

So these surveys will give us some metrics to inform the work, and we hope that that will be a step forward for the committee.

We also have a space I mentioned in the last session for members to contribute improvements that they see as you're working through it, so that will be there.



---

Finally, we renamed the form from SOI, as we all know, which is of course Statements of Interest, that know whether we have conflicts and so forth, to Application Request Form, so that makes it much more clear. Next slide, please.

The key actions that we've undertaken were to review the entire set of instructions to make sure that they were language-friendly, as mentioned. We've moved long blocks of text into drop-down text boxes to make it less intimidating.

We reformatted the applicant choices, and we coupled that with the region, so that will better inform the committee's work. I can share with you that as we made our way around the leadership team with the chair and the associate chair and myself yesterday, visiting all of the various stakeholder groups, we explained very clearly they should please give us more choices. In other words, if you would like to go for the Board, that's fine, but please look at the rest of the leadership positions and check those boxes so that we can actually now take advantage of high-quality candidates that may not fit in one place. We can now look at them in another position. As we know, if they haven't checked that box, we can't look at them for those other opportunities.

Following on the success of asking people to load photos last year so we could actually have an image and know who we're talking about, we've made that mandatory this year, and we're taking the next step to say, "Please optionally put up a 60-second video so that you can explain why you're the candidate for the job." That's very much optional. As Ken mentioned this morning, we haven't seen too many of them, but I do expect that we will, and hopefully that will be a positive step forward. I



---

think to be able to see how a person expresses themselves will also inform what they look like on paper. Next slide, please.

The Members Workspace. We've also talked about the evaluations, the ratings, and personal polling this morning, so we're pretty clear on that. The fully revised application form was tested by all the members of the subcommittee, as well as we had staff test it, so we would have a sense of whether or not this form is working properly, and I think the feedback has been very positive to date.

In that regard, staff, because of course they're a captive audience, have said they're satisfied with the revisions, and I'm very grateful to hear that. We do need to incorporate a new field. This came to our attention when people had actually applied and they made a mistake on their e-mail address. Staff was not able to respond back to the. That was a field that we missed, so now we will have a place to make sure they put that in twice, or give us an alternate address so that we don't lose those individuals who might have made a typo when they were applying to us.

We need to add a section on country of citizen, residence, and country of domicile so that we can respond appropriately to applicants that might be applying for positions for which they're ineligible.

This is again a little bit of detail [inaudible] in the weeds on this one, but the reason for that is just to help inform the applicants that if they're applying, for example, as a board member for the Asia Pac space that there's no space available for them. But if they would like to participate in another role, they would be most welcome.



---

So these are the refinements that we've had. With that, that's the end of that report, and again, I would turn to the committee as a whole to bring your comments or questions to the floor. If there are no comments or questions, then we can, as the chair just suggested, approve it immediately.

Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Ron. I'd like to point out on behalf of the committee that we have tested the form specifically under low bandwidth conditions.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you very much, Satish. I'm grateful that you brought that to the table. Indeed, it's really important to understand that people are working with different types of technology on different bandwidths. That's one of the places that we've improved this year I think significantly over last year.

Any other thoughts or comments? If that's the case, I just want to make note of who is on this committee with me because this committee has done an excellent job. That's John Levine, Sylvia Herlein Leite, Satish Babu, and Yrjo Lansipuro. Thank you to that committee.

Chair, I don't see any objections, so perhaps we can . . .

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much, Ron. Thanks to the committee. We will then consider that this, too, is something that we will consider a done deal.



---

We will move onto the next subcommittee report. Before doing that, I'll just add that this is something I perhaps should have said at the start, but for those of you who are not part of the Nominating Committee joining this meeting, we apologize for the size of the room and the shape of the room. It's not very welcoming for you. We have tried several times to get a more welcoming room for our open meetings, and we'll continue to work on that.

The Nominating Committee is committed to holding an open meeting at each ICANN meeting and making sure that we are always sharing with the community the way in which we do our work. We understand that that's not very easy if to do so we are stuck away in a room that's hard to find and doesn't have very accommodating seating.

So on behalf of the committee, apologies for that. We will continue to work with ICANN meetings staff to get better results. I'm disappointed with the room that we have today. I don't think this is the way to promote the committee's commitment to transparency.

Having said that, let me turn now to Yrjo for the next subcommittee report. Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Stephane. The Transparency Subcommittee consists of Fatimata Seye Sylla, Louis Houle, Alain Bidron, Zahid Jamil, and Juhani Juselius, and me as the Chair.

Our task was to further develop the transparency aspects of this committee. Of course, this committee was formerly known as a black



---

box, where something happens inside and then white smoke comes out and we have a [board.]

In 2013, we started to change this state of affairs a little bit, and of course it's always a question of a balance between transparency and confidentiality requirements, which are of course paramount.

Our first recommendation was to adopt the same balance between these two things, between confidentiality and transparency, as we have been doing since 2013 with maximal transparency within the limits set by the confidentiality requirements, regarding the personal data of candidates and the processes [open data] is secret. That is our motto.

But of course, we are giving and we have already given out aggregate information about candidates, about regional gender distribution when that becomes available. All that will be published, but the names themselves and the personal information remains secret and confidential.

The next recommendation is that we continue issuing the report cards for the community during the entire NomCom cycle. This will be an improvement compared to the last year's practice, when during the most sort of confidential part of our work we just stopped issuing this.

Now we feel that we have to report on our work. Even so, we cannot say so much about the substance during that time, but we just have to show that we're still alive and working.

Next, number three, attract more community participation to NomCom open meetings. I hope that we can, as you said, try to get a better room in Buenos Aires. Anyway, the recommendation is that we should make



---

these open meetings more meaningful and try to attract more participation from the community. Next slide, please.

Social media: we should try to intensify our use of it, whether it's Facebook, Twitter, or whatever they are. But of course, we want to use the ICANN Communications Department as our systems here because we can't just start sprouting out information individually to all these places in the social media.

Number five, make the chair's interview on the web page a regular feature at all important junctures of the NomCom cycle. That is also something that is already being implemented.

The final recommendation is that there would be a detailed and comprehensive final report, like there was last year when we had Cheryl's report. It was so detailed that if you were interested in knowing how the NomCom operates, you could actually follow it and find it as a roadmap of how that happens. So the recommendation is that a similar, as-detailed, comprehensive will be issued also for this NomCom cycle.

This completes the report. Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Yrjo. Any questions or comments? Is that a question?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a comment.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: A comment.



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm a member of the committee and I think that it's a great thing that we've done. One of the things that has happened is the graphical representation in Item #2. There are two graphical representations. One is process. You just look it and you know exactly which part of the process sort of you were in, and the second is there's a map and it will tell you where the outreach has been in that [inaudible] as the outreach happened. So I think that's pretty helpful.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much. Anyone that's not in the Nominating Committee, please feel free if you do want to ask questions. Once again, I apologize for the unfriendly structure of the room, but if you want to come to the table, we'll try to accommodate you as best we can.

Ron?

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you, chair. I just want to point out to those who are more recent members of the committee that might not be aware of this report card that it's come from very humble beginnings, where it was a very black-on-white banging out of who was here and very innocuous statements to a much more interesting read. I commend the committee under Yrjo's leadership to what we have today.

This more recent report card is really, really excellent. With the graphic elements and so forth it puts forward very clearly the type of work we're doing and I think makes somewhat the dry toast work that we do





---

a little more elegant and more attractive and interesting. I commend the committee, and I'm very excited about this. I'm almost concerned that the 2016 Nominating Committee, if we don't have a Yrjo journalistic approach. It started . . .

YRJO LANSIPURO: You can hire me as a personal consultant.

RON ANDRUFF: As an Associate Associate Chair. But quite seriously, you've raised the bar very high, and I just wanted to commend all of you for that work. Thank you very much.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: There are a couple of consultants with journalistic expertise in the room that I'm sure will be happy to serve Ron.

Please, at the end, I have a mic for you if Joette – thank you. Or you can use that thing in front of you. Yeah. Thanks.

BERAN GILLEN: Hello, everyone. My name is Beran Gillen. I'm actually a NomCom Appointee for At-Large. My term expires this year. I just wanted to pick up on point #4. We at AFRALO have actually been using Twitter and Facebook, and we've been able to get two people to apply for the NomCom position for this year, so I think that's something that we really need to drive here in the NomCom. Thank you.



---

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, both for participating and for making that point. Thank you very much.

Also, I just want to add that what you're seeing here is a continuation of the work that the Nominating Committee is constantly doing to try to reinvent itself, to try to make sure that the way it works is clearer for the community.

There have been mentions of report card, videos, etc. We are trying very hard to make sure that the community knows what we're doing, and we are looking for support from ICANN as well, for example, with the videos that are done with the support of ICANN, the rooms we've already mentioned, and the logistics of holding meetings that are online as well as having remote participation. All that stuff is done working with ICANN obviously to try to get that done.

We're trying to make sure that the process of choosing these candidates really is as transparent as possible, but we're very, very keen to have input, responses, comments, criticism, and questions from the community on this.

Understanding that this meeting is being recorded and that those people that may not be attending now will have a chance to read the transcript, listen to the recording, listen to the subcommittee reports that we've had, please do not hesitate to bring your comments or your questions to us. This is very much a work in progress, and we will continue to look at this.

One final word on one of the challenges that is before every Nominating Committee, and that is the fact that the basic way that the Nominating



---

Committee is set up is that each committee is separate. One of the challenges that we have had in the past and that the leadership team here has been working on very hard is how do we not lose the experience that previous Nominating Committees have built up whilst maintaining that assumption that each committee is separate?

I'll give you an example. At the end of each NomCom cycle, all committee members are asked to systematically delete all files that they have with respect to that cycle. That obviously includes candidate data, but it also includes process data, so it then becomes difficult to make sure that we do maintain that transfer of experience.

So those are just some of the issues, just to make sure everyone's aware, that we're grappling with. How do we pass on the experience? [How do we make sure that, once again, the report card is an example that work started a few years ago?] So far, the baton has been passed on because those people that did the work are still in the committee. But obviously, that's not sustainable long-term, so how do we make sure that those good practices are kept? Those are all questions that we're grappling with and we don't necessarily have an answer for right now.

Zahid?

ZAHID JAMIL:

I was just thinking about something that you were just mentioning when he was talking about the committee: that processes are not confidential but data is confidential. I imagine that everything we were just talking about is really process-driven. Again, we don't want to



---

hamper any innovation in any new NomCom, but these are examples that could be left with the secretariat or staff and say, “Here’s a sort of archive of processes that have been used,” and it’s up to them to decide next year whether they want to do it or not.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah, you’re absolutely right. That’s also why we have an associate chair, chair-elect – so the experience is also passed on by the leadership. But I think this still requires some thought. Ron next year will probably also want to work on this to make sure that it continues to improve.

Ron, you wanted to speak?

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you, chair. I just wanted to pick up on what you said, Zahid, because, yes, process open data secret. Now, it’s really interesting, and you will see, particularly the newcomers to the committee, that when we start talking, we’re going to be talking about Candidate C145. Then we’re going to talk about Candidate B276. There will be no names discussed. We’re just going to be fully in that until we finally get through to the point where we’ve shortlisted and now we want to be very specific so you’re not confused about who I’m talking about. Then the names will actually come into play.

So it’s really confidentiality. What day of the week is it exactly of the ICANN meeting?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It must be Friday.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you very much. What Cheryl just said, that element is very, very important because everything that we're doing here is so critical to the organization, but also we have to respect every one of the candidates who puts the information forward with that understanding that we will be very careful with that. Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks. Any further comments? Any questions from the floor? In which case, Cheryl, you have the last report. I think it will be short.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It certainly will be short. However, it is important, so it is going to be discussed.

I wanted to bring to the community's attention that as you may have seen over the last couple years, particularly as we've unwrapped the NomCom processes that there's always an attempt, or at least recently an attempt, to look at issues and challenges that we are aware of and try to use some committee time to come up with solutions.

One of the things we're going to do with this particular year's NomCom, once the important work of the Outreach and everything is over – we're going to get our people in first – and while those assessments are going on, we're going to be looking at the area of alternates because we have been challenged not one year but two years in a row where in the



---

absence of anything reasonable, effective, efficient, and easily understood, we cannot deal with casual vacancies.

So we've got a small subcommittee. It's in the very early phases. It hasn't even had its first meeting. In the watch-this space, the work of the Alternate Subcommittee that you will find in the final report I think – well of course, I am biased – will make fascinating reading. And I might even pop in a little pop quiz or something, a little link that you can all go to and give us feedback.

But this is a very important issue. It is a known challenge, and rest assured we will be doing that work as well. Is that it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Cheryl. We're excited and looking forward to it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: This speaks exactly to what I was referring to a while ago. This is work that we've undertaken because past experience has shown us we have a problem here. And it is a problem. The last two instances of the NomCom had to grapple with this problem in some way or another.



---

In the final report this year, when we sit down – Cheryl, Ron and I –and huddle and cuddle and make that report – perhaps too much information – but we will I think want to recommend to 2016 that they build on those experience transfer processes so that this improves and continues to improve.

Any questions on the Alternates Subcommittee? Any comments? Any general comments from the floor?

I think we can consider that all the subcommittee reports that we've just had are approved. In that case, I thank all the subcommittee members for their work and ongoing work. As we've just seen, there's ongoing work, and these are ongoing pieces of work that we will continue to manage as we go forth.

We have a little time left. We have about 15 minutes. Is that correct?

As we put up a few links and social media, URLs for people to use, there are a couple things that I wanted to discuss, but perhaps first of all I can once again open it up to you. Are there any points that committee members want to discuss in the 15 minutes that we have left that we need to address?

Okay, hearing or seeing no one – sorry, spoke too soon. Don?

DON BLUMENTHAL:

Sorry. This is more personal, since I don't think there's any more NomCom sessions this week, are there?



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

DON BLUMENTHAL: Well, I'm going to say this anyway because there may be a problem like there was this morning. As some of you know, I'm not with the Public Interest Registry anymore. I was cleared to represent the Registry Stakeholder Group for this meeting, but I don't know if that's going to continue to Buenos Aires. I've enjoyed the opportunity for one and two-thirds years. I hope I continue, but if I don't, I'll see you around the building or in Buenos Aires in some other role. But it's been enjoyable. I will send out contact information at some point. Thanks.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: It's been a pleasure working with you, Don, and I hope it doesn't stop here. Thanks for letting us know.

In the last 10 or 15 minutes, I wanted to discuss some of the work that we'll be doing later on. We have started this discussion already on how we want to work and how we want to work towards going to towards BA and our final selection meeting there.

First of all, for the benefit of the new members or those that have not been on the committee for many years, we've spent some time over the last few days explaining how we're going to progress towards the selection meeting in Buenos Aires. Are there any questions or points that you feel we should be looking at in terms of the work there? We've talked about the way we would handle the candidates once the application period is over, and that may be a topic that we don't want to go too deep into during open meeting.





---

We've talked about the diving and decided that the teams that we have worked on we would use for deep diving. We've talked about how deep diving should be done, and that conversation I had to cut off slightly this morning, so if we want to pick it up again, there's time to do it now.

We've talked about the general calendar of events leading up to Buenos Aires. If there are any questions there, now's the time to ask. We've talked about the Buenos Aires itself and the fact that we would start the week with certain things that we would do – interviews, etc. – and then end the week with the selections.

So on all of that, if there are any questions, please feel free. I see Robert. I see John B.

ROBERT GUERRA:

I have I guess a comment/question. For those who may have not been on the committee last year, something that was particularly helpful is really trying to reduce the pool of people that are up for discussion in the selection meeting to as small a number as possible so we're not just swamped with just seeing people the whole time, because I think something that was valuable that I believe happened in London – again, it was my first cycle last time – is we got to speak with some people. They participated in the ICANN meeting. We could see them participate during the ICANN meeting, and then we could ask them to reflect on the ICANN meeting, so in a way we could see how they participated in the meeting, which if they weren't ICANN people was particularly helpful.

So think it's just the work between now and Buenos Aires would be really good to reduce our list to as small a list as possible so we can



---

actually have that component there, and we can have a richer conversation. So that's one.

The second item, which is an item that I discussed with Brenden and a few others during one of the breaks today, is if I recall correctly we haven't talked about the voting or the polling that takes place towards the end. If I remember correctly, it was either yes or no for particular candidates. There are more nuanced ways to vote; for example, preferential systems where if there are three candidates in the slot, instead of just voting for one, you can say, "This is my first candidate. This is my second candidate, or my third or my first and my second," and that could help us going forward when we come up with lists of folks. We had a discussion towards the end last year, but because the slate and the documentation got cleared, that would be something that I would like to not necessary open up for discussion now, but something to consider as we move forward and we go into the phase where polling and voting come in that we use more nuanced systems, which might make it easier for us going forward.

Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Robert. Those are good points. We can certainly open it up now for discussion. We just need to make sure that we do distinguish between polling and voting because those are very different things in our processes.

John B.?



---

JOHN BERRYHILL: Yeah, I actually had a question for Don. In election to the NomCom is as an individual, each voting delegate shall serve a one-year term. There's a provision for vacancies to be filled. Are you saying that you're withdrawing from the Nominating Committee, the registries have made you withdraw from the committee, or for some other reason you feel you must withdraw from the committee?

DON BLUMENTHAL: I didn't realize this was going to be a – it was more just a “good working with you.” It's up to the Stakeholder Group at this point. I'm willing to continue. It certainly makes sense for me to continue as their representative if they so choose because I don't think I have to be a member of an organization that's part of the Stakeholder Group in order to serve.

JOHN BERRYHILL: I – go ahead.

DON BLUMENTHAL: That's the working assumption. If there are rules that bar me from continuing, fine. But at this point, I'm willing to. If the Stakeholder Group says they don't want me to and they replace me, so be it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]



---

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I'm a little bit wary about – I'll let you get back in just a minute. I just want to say I'm a little bit wary about where this might be going in an open meeting. I'll let you get back to it, but I will just say that I had a general conversation, without singling anyone out, with the registries about the importance in my mind of – because obviously Don has shared this information with us leaders a few days ago, so I was aware of it, but it was not place to share it until Don chose to.

I did make it clear that in my mind and my experience, once you start a NomCom cycle, it's good to finish it, and anybody that comes in halfway through is going to be under pressure. I think it's doing the system a disservice. So that message I passed on, but we deal with what the sending organizations send us.

John, back to you.

JOHN BERRYHILL: The reason we have bylaws is because they're written down and they are public, and there is no provision in the bylaws for the NomCom for a constituency organization to recall a NomCom appointee. Rule number one: each voting delegate shall serve a one-year term. Then it says vacancies can be filled by whatever means come up.

Don, I think that you have been elected by the registries to serve a one-year term as your election as Don Blumenthal, not as an employee of any organization. Unless you choose to withdraw from the Nominating Committee, you're going to stay on the Nominating Committee, and that is true of anyone else in the room who may no longer employed by [inaudible] got them. But you were elected. The whole point – again, if



---

you read this criteria for selecting Nominating Committee delegates:  
accomplished person of integrity, objectivity, intelligence—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JOHN BERRYHILL: Yeah, except for the registrars, who get a waiver on that. No, but each criteria begins with persons with [inaudible], persons whom the selecting body, person who are – you are elected here because of the characteristics that Don Blumenthal has, which the registries felt befit them to put you on the Nominating Committee. You are here as Don Blumenthal, not as an employee of PIR.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks for that, John. I do think this is important, and I will add that if we read the bylaws correctly – and it's always difficult to read the bylaws directly, but if we do, we can even consider that a group like the registries don't necessarily need to elect someone that's a registry. They can elect anybody, even someone that's outside of their group.

So the fact that you're no longer an employee of a registry I don't see why that should . . . Anyway, what we'll do – and I think, John, you've helped us here – is Joette, [Gia] – we will continue to work with the Registry Stakeholder Group leadership to make sure that they understand the rules.



---

JOHN BERRYHILL:                   And if I could add –

DON BLUMENTHAL:               John, please [inaudible]

JOHN BERRYHILL:               I'm just saying it's up to you.

DON BLUMENTHAL:               That's precisely the point, and I'm not going to push it if the Stakeholder Group says, no matter what the bylaws say, if some point overrides law. I haven't practiced in 23 years. If the Stakeholder Group says, "We don't want you there anymore," I'm not going to do it.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER:         That's the point.

JOHN BERRYHILL:               I would say that the Nominating Committee acts with a certain amount of independence and that if we get into a situation where outside bodies can at any time determine the composition of the Nominating Committee, I think that goes against what these rules are trying to say because you get into a question of undue influence.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER:         Thanks. Zahid, and then Robert.

---

ZAHID JAMIL: I remember when we were putting our names into the hat – throwing our hats in the ring; oh my God, metaphors are going all crazy this morning. But anyway, the issue was that if you were the BC, you're not representing the BC's interest, we don't go back and report, we don't take constructions. You're supposed to be able to represent as an individual, as a person yourself.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: We have four minutes left and a hard stop at 12:00, just to let you know. Robert?

ROBERT GUERRA: I'll say I'm a little bit uncomfortable with the conversation because usually when we talk about issues of personal confidentiality we usually have a more – so I thank Don for raising this in a public space, but I'm uncomfortable with speaking of it further in a public space. The way I see it is it's fine that these points are being raised, but it's about an individual. It's about something that is more like an HR stuff or whatever, and not being raised. If there's one thing the NomCom is known for, it's respecting confidentiality, and we should be doing that a lot more in this particular issue. Thanks.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Any further comments? Brenden, you're dying to speak.

BRENDEN KUERBIS: Thanks, Stephane. As someone who came onto the NomCom halfway through a cycle, I fully concur with Stephane's earlier point. Also, being



---

someone who got to work closely with Don last year, personally I would hope that you would stay on. I just wanted to express that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORRL [We] respect your choices.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much. We'll bring this discussion and the meeting to a close, which means we don't have time to talk about the calendar items and the work that we're going to do, but we'll have more time to do it later.

Thank you all, including the audience, for participating. Nominating Committee members, please be back here at 1:00. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

