
BUENOS AIRES – Nominating Committee Public Meeting
Wednesday, November 20, 2013 – 10:30 to 12:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Welcome to the top-level. We didn't apply for .nomcom but we got the top-level anyway. Please sit down, we'll start in a second. We'll just get the Final Report on the screen. Okay, this is a public meeting of the Nominating Committee 2013 and 2014. I believe it's a historical first, because I don't think that there were public meetings that were introduced until 2013, and then that both Committees meet around a table is of course also new.

Can I ask the Members, for the benefit of each other and also for the benefit of our audience, of the 2013 Committee, put their hands up? Thank you. Now 2014? Okay. I think that's a majority. Without further ado I'll present the Report. It's posted on the NomCom site and it's also available on paper, so I don't spend too much time on that.

You can read it anyway. It's a summary and says what our task was, and of course the 2013 Committee had two extra tasks, in addition to the posts we were asked to fill, we selected one extra Board Member after [Judith? 00:06:10] resigned. We also selected a ccNSO Council Member to replace Mary Wong, who resigned. These are the Members of the Committee and this is the timetable.

This was our timeline, starting with the kick-off meeting in Toronto. The application period that started in November and ended on May 1st – that was the original deadline – May 15th was what it was extended to. Here

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.

you can see that the actual evaluation assessment period was quite short, but we managed to do our work. Now, the Report is basically a chronological narrative of what we did.

We discussed at the kick-off meeting... We made a couple of important decisions regarding the Rules of Procedure. We decided to record the proceedings of the Committee in case there would be controversies later about what had been said. Actually we spent quite a lot of time after the kick-off meeting to establish the rules of those recordings. One of the rules is that they will be destroyed after this weekend, because they were just for the benefit of the NomCom.

As it happens they were never actually used for the purpose of establishing facts afterwards, which was good, but they were there in case they were needed. We also set up Sub-Committees. The Sub-Committee for Outreach was chaired by Cheryl. The Sub-Committee for Conflict of Interest was chaired by Vanda and the External Recruitment Assistance was chaired by Adam Peake.

The first phase of our work, like for any NomCom, is the outreach and recruitment. Outreach was done at all possible meetings around the world. You have a partial list here, and the other part of this work was external recruitment assistance, which we decided to have. That was the contacts to the [OB inaudible 00:10:10] were handled by Adam Peake, and Stéphane Van Gelder.

It was, I will say, a positive experience to work with them. We had some discussions in the beginning on how we would make the SOIs coming from them, or through them, from candidates they recruited,

compatible with the other SOIs, and that problem was solved. The evaluation phase – as I said, we didn't have too much time for that.

There was the first round, after which 29 candidates were sent for evaluation and interviews to this recruitment for OB, [induction? 00:11:20]. In the second round we actually succeeded in bringing down the number of Board Candidates who were invited to Durban for in-person interviews. That number was nine, and that was clearly something that should not be exceeded; nine or ten, because there's previous experience of inviting as many as 16 candidates to the final meeting and that's clearly too much.

Our final selection meeting was two days, as usual, with straw polls and a final vote. Then the last phase of the NomCom work reporting, was the announcement of the selectees, which happened after due diligence was performed. Of course their names are here in the Report. Then, when we thought that everything had been done and it was smooth sailing up until Buenos Aires, all of a sudden there was an email from Bruce Duncan that said, "You have to do some more work."

So we selected the replacement for Mrs. [Doabit? 00:13:10], and we just managed to do that just in time. That is to say, the announcement of Wolfgang's selection was made just before this meeting here. Any questions, especially from the 2014 Committee Members about this? I think that this narrative is quite self-explanatory, and of course we'll be here... Yes, go ahead?

ADAM PEAKE: Good morning everybody. I'm Adam Peake. I'm the 2013 Member. I was the Associate Chair last year and had the pleasure of working for my boss, Yrjö. There's one thing I've realized that's probably not in the Report, so I should have noticed this before. The Nominating Committees sign a Code of Conduct, which is something that helps you understand what your obligations are, particularly in terms of confidentiality of candidate information.

But I think it's something worth sharing with all of the Committees and not necessarily to amend the Report, but it's certainly something that, given the nature of the work we do to treat candidates fairly, to treat their information in confidence, it's particularly important. It also guides how information is handled, for example at the AGM, that immaculate time when one Committee turns into another – 2013 ends, 2014 starts.

"I will be deleting all the information I have about candidates," and so on and so forth. So the Code of Conduct is something that really guides you through the year and is important in that way. Thanks.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you Adam. Did you... Stéphane, please.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Stéphane Van Gelder, Member of the 2013 Committee and Chair-Elect of the 2014 Committee. Just to pick up on Adam's point about confidentiality of data and what the Committee does with it, because we're in a transitional phase, I think it's useful if we can just have a short discussion about that. Both being mindful of the 2013 Members that are going into the 2014 Committee, and those new Members coming into

the 2014 Committee, I think it's useful to ascertain how we want to treat data.

Now, I'm not talking about candidate data – I'm sure it's very clear to everybody that that is confidential – I'm talking about data that could be useful to the new Committee from the old one, such as contracts or otherwise that we did with outside parties, processes we might have covered, that sort of thing.

I don't think it's clear... It's certainly not clear in my mind, but it's not clear in everybody's minds how that should be handled, but it's clear in my mind that the 2013 Committee can be useful there for the next group. Thank you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Thank you. Actually, this is something we can discuss when we go to the next point, and that is to say recommendations. There is one recommendation that is directly this. Bill, please.

BILL MANNING:

If you go back and read the public reports from the previous NomComs, you'll find that there is an attempt to pass that sort of institutional knowledge on, including our use in the 2013 cycle of outside consultants. That was recommended and implemented several NomComs ago and published in the Final Report. So the Final Report is the vehicle for passing on institutional knowledge about how the NomCom has worked in the past, and advice for how it may want to work in the future.

If it's not in the Final Reports and it should be, then there's clearly a way in which we can reach out and talk to the Chair and say, "We think this is missing from the Report – please put it in."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bill, I respect what you're saying, and yes, that body of work is a very important contributor to what can take knowledge and experience, as well as proposal and future planning, from one NomCom to another. I think Stéphane's points were going to things like the details of contracts – things one would not be putting in a public report.

I think he was talking about pieces of process or forms of the questions we would ask. A lot more administrivia. I believe Stéphane was proposing to have a mechanism from passing on from to another, and you've got a queue now.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Adam?

ADAM PEAKE: I've always understood that the information that would be destroyed – and this is actually in the Code of Conduct that we signed in 2013, and the 2014 Committee would of course get the opportunity to amend and consider their own code; that's something you'd do over your weekend meeting – but in 2013 we agreed that we shall destroy all confidential materials relating to the work of the Committee.

I think 'confidential materials' have always been interpreted as meaning the SOIs, the references, any notes you might have taken that are about

a candidate. There would be documents held by both ICANN admin staff and also by the Chair and others, related to, for example, a contract with the management consulting firm.

That's information that we probably wouldn't want to share, because it's of a commercial nature, but it is something that could and should be transferred onto the next Committee, because it's functional as opposed to confidential information about human beings. So I don't think there's any problem with transferring operational information, it's simply the candidate information that we're asked to delete.

It's amazing how these things get stuck in back-ups and you find one from 2006, and it's always very embarrassing when that happens, but we try not to...

SPEAKER:

So that particular mode of operation, where you have functional material that you want to pass on, which is not related to persons, and in a Final Report you can have a Public Final Report and you can have a Closed Addendum, which has happened in the past, where functional materials were left with ICANN staff to be reused. So that's a mechanism that's been used in the past. I don't think we used it this time.

It's certainly something that can be done and has been used in the past, speaking as someone who's been on the NomCom for far too long.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Okay. This is since all the leadership team of the 2014 Committee was already ended in 2013. There's nothing to prevent us keeping things in our heads so that perhaps when we talk about, for instance, experiences with [inaudible 00:21:49], one thing is the actual papers and documents but then the other is actually our institutional memories of how it actually happened.

I think that that will help in practice, that we have that knowledge. Now, let's go through the recommendations. These are such that they were approved already, so this is mainly to see if there are any questions relating to them or any more information needed. The first one is that future Nominating Committees are urged to develop further the openness and transparency of the NomCom processes, while maintaining the absolute confidentiality and privacy of candidate information.

I think this is quite clear, and it's really up to the next Committee to further develop this process we've had with monthly report cards, for instance, with open meetings at every ICANN meeting, and so on and so forth. The second recommendation comes close to what we were just discussing: "A discussion on how to improve continuity between successive NomComs, while respecting the confidentiality and privacy of candidate information should continue."

"Elaboration of guidelines and criteria for confidentiality and privacy of candidate information could be considered." This is, I guess, something that will come up during the two days of the kick-off meeting. The third one: "NomCom physical meeting schedules should include training on candidate interview techniques and relevant other recruitment HR skills."

Number four: “Concerns the design of the SOI forums and recommendation forums.” This is also something that I think will be discussed. The main problem with the forums, as experienced by the candidates, has been that it’s not savable. You have to fill the form in in one go and send it away, and there are a couple of ways of course to make it savable, and they will be discussed on Friday and Saturday.

Number five: “New outreach methods should be developed, for instance a monthly newsletter,” which would be like a public version of the monthly report card we had. That’s something that we’ll discuss.

Number six: “NomCom should set an aspirational goal of achieving 50/50 general balance in the candidate polls for each group of assistance.

“All candidates, whether recruited by NomCom and other ICANN community outreach, or from any contracted professional recruitment agency, should use the same common SOI format and style when completing their applications.” I feel this is important from the point of view of treating candidates equally. We had some discussions with [inaudible 00:26:10] because first they said, “We’ll give you all the information about candidates so there’s no need for them to fill in the SOI forms.”

There was some discussion back and forth and eventually we agreed on a procedure that meant that we first get candidate information from OB, in the form they produce it in. Then the Committee select it from all those applications, or all those items. Then, those who we thought had some possibilities and merits, and then OB asked them, these selected

candidates, to fill in SOI forms, so that in the end they were on a comparable level with other candidates.

Number eight: “We expressed the hope that ICANN should ensure that a Nominating Committee has adequate administrative and state-of-the-art technical resources at all stages of its work.” This refers especially to situations like we have here, at the end of this week, and also the final selection meeting, like we’re going to have in London.

That is to say, when the old facilities are here, as long as the ICANN meeting continues, when it stops then everything else stops and our staff has to scramble for facilities. So we have to ensure that we have the same level of technical facilities. It’s also very important, at the final selection meeting, when we might have to interview candidates remotely using Skype or other methods.

Nine. This may be a bit cryptic for the new Members, but anyway: “The format for interviews with shortlisted Board candidates needs to be further developed.” This is mainly an idea that when we have our one-hour interviews with a number of candidates, then we should have time for a repeat performance with some of them – with those who we actually think could be selected.

Ten is what I’ve already mentioned, the technical facilities for remote interviews. They should be improved. 11: “The follow up processes after NomCom has made its selection decisions, should be further developed and documented.” We entered into uncharted territory after the selection meeting was over, and then eventually there was the need to produce one more selectee. This was when one Board Member resigned.

So we didn't have any specific rules for such situations, and we managed to do it by relying on common sense and the unanimous decisions by the Committee. But it would be good to have all these rules in writing, also when it comes to ordinates, that is to say when we select Members of the Board and so on and so forth, those people are ordinates that will be next in line, in case something happens with those that have been recently selected.

Finally, the next NomCom review should be an opportunity to making more bylaw level changes, if necessary, and that's the end of the recommendations from the side of 2013. Anybody... Any questions or comments? Yes?

SARAH DEUTSCH:

Sarah Deutsch from the BC At-Large Business Rep. I just had a question about the third party that does the interviewing. Was that firm the same as the firm used in the past, and what was the experience with that firm?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

That's right, yes. Well, the experience, I think there were no problems with that. Yes?

SATISH BABU:

Thank you. I'm Satish Babu from the Computer Society of India and APRALO. I have two questions. One relates to the fact that all information on candidates is destroyed after the cycle is over. I just want to know if with the next year the same candidate applies, do we go

through the same information gathering process? Is there any learning that we pass on, on a candidate basis, to the next year? I gathered no, but I just want to confirm that.

The second point is, is there any feedback that you collect from the candidates on the procedural aspects of the NomCom's functioning, so that it might add to or improve the next year's functioning?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

The answer is, in my totally biased view, no, we do not do sufficiently on the second part, and that's something I'd like to think the 2014 NomCom may wish to do. Those who have in fact been confirmed in their roles are public enough for us to approach and have a conversation with. It may be more problematic for those who've not been confirmed, but those of us who are serving in both Committees and have knowledge of who applied and was not confirmed.

I'm sure there's a way around that and it's something I'd very much like to see happen. In fact it's a question that when the Leadership Team for 2014 met with the Board Governance Committee in preparation for our work together with all of you in 2014 on Friday, there was an opportunity for me to say to a reappointed Board Member that we'd like to hear how it was from your perspective. I think we ought to do a lot more of that. Thanks for the question Satish, it's excellent.

ROBERT GUERRA:

Robert Guerra from the SSAC and incoming 2014 NomCom. In the recommendations, as you were going through them, you mentioned there was a nuance that could perhaps be understood a little bit better

later, so I'm just wondering to what extent the recommendations will be discussed in the upcoming meetings, starting Friday/Saturday, to maybe add a bit more nuance?

To see if there are specific recommendations or actions that the incoming NomCom might be able to act on or push out to the Board or others?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yes, of course it's entirely up to the 2014 Committee as to what they do with the recommendations, the recommendations from 2013. For instance, what we did in Toronto was we went through the recommendations from the previous Committee, and in light of them, in some cases we changed our Rules of Procedure. They were the changes that needed to happen so that they could be [inaudible 00:35:24]. I think that this is probably what will happen this time too. Ron please.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you Chair. It's good to see everyone again from the 2013, and welcome to those coming into 2014. We had a very collegial group last year and it was very exciting work that we did. What was the best part of it, I think, is that when we arrived in the first meeting in Toronto we made a pact amongst ourselves and that pact was, "As we walk through this door we park our constituencies, our relationships, all outside, and we come in here and lock arms as a team to really do the best we can to build an institution of ICANN."

The good news is – and I take great pride in being part of that team, because the gentlemen such as [Bruno Lavanne? 00:36:15] joining the

Board, and Daniel Reed joining the gNSO Council] are very, very highly qualified individuals that really raise the bar. One of the things that we said was that we'd try to make the work of the 2014 NomCom very difficult by putting that bar so high that it would be difficult to get over it.

I just wanted to bring that forward because I think the placement – and I've only spoken about two –, we filled the slate of eight or nine individuals, and it was a very... From my side we brought a lot of value to every one of the positions that we were looking to fill. So I just wanted to reiterate that again today, as we're kicking off the 2014 work, that wherever we come from is irrelevant.

What we're here to do is something that's really important together, and I'm very happy to see faces I didn't know were on here – faces I know and those I don't – because it's important also that we have fresh blood, fresh ideas and so forth; dialogue and discussion – so I'm looking forward to that.

One last note I would make, if I may, Chair, just coming back to this comment about notes and any documentation and destroying and all of that – what is very important, literally from this day, is to take a book and make that your NomCom book. Or, in your computer. The point I'm making here is to make notes on everything. Write down everything that we're doing.

What happened was, as the Chair has mentioned, was we had to go back and fill two spaces after the fact, and fortunately some of us kept our notes or we still had them, because we hadn't deleted them quite frankly. Those notes were very helpful to go back and review the

qualifications of the individuals to say, “Okay, now we have to put someone to fill Judith’s space. Okay, let’s go back and look.”

We knew the criteria that we’d established going in, but we wanted to make sure that when we went back and put someone in that place, it wasn’t just a stop-gap measure, but indeed someone that was very carefully considered. We spent a lot of time and dialogue, but it was very easy over the case of nine or ten months to forget what was said back then.

That was one of the reasons that the Chair also mentioned we had a ‘go back to’ space, where we could go back and play a recording, if we found ourselves in a stick about, “How did we handle that? I can’t remember,” and we could go back and use it. We didn’t have to use it but it was nice to have it. So in the same way, I strongly recommend that everyone just get a book and fill the pages of it with every thought, comment and so forth, as we’re going through this.

It’s a great reference over the course of the year, to go back and be able to see what we were doing. We’re all busy with our day jobs and we’re busy with our ICANN work, and that gives you one place where everything is and keeps a clear line, so that’s my comment. Thank you very much.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Thank you so much for that advice. Yes?

SPEAKER: Thank you Chair. [Varadi? 00:36:17]. I want to quickly build up on the question that Robert raised on the recommendations, because it's one thing that we have them on the paper right now, and there are definitely nuances behind them, and I think what's really worth doing during the upcoming Friday and Saturday is to sit down and look into how exactly we're going to design the implementation of those recommendations and to validate whether they are still relevant and useful, and that they make sense in the context of those discussions.

So I think we should dedicate enough time to make sure that we deliver a clear message and understanding to the new Members of the NomCom, on what exactly is meant by those recommendations. It's important to avoid any misinterpretation of what's been recommended. Thank you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you. Any more? Yes?

ROBERT GUERRA: [if others? 00:40:26] spoken, it's just a completely different topic. All right, so just in terms of the timeline that you mentioned, I've served on the SSAC NomCom but also on the .ca NomCom too. One of the things we've done in the .ca NomCom process is, in addition to having an external company or organization trying to recruit candidates, there's also – at least in the past – what was called a Diversity Report.

This was an outside group that takes a look at the gaps in either the Board or other parts that are being filled, and they interview the staff and others, just to give some advice to the NomCom on what are the

gaps in the skills that that body has, or gaps that exist, to give recommendations in doing outreach efforts and then in selecting them.

I'm just curious as to whether that type of analysis of skills, knowledge, language skills and stuff like that has been done, and if not, might that be an idea? I'm happy to propose that in the other session as well, but I thought I'd do that in the open session as well. The gender gap issue that I saw I think is great, but there may be other gaps as well. That may be a way to pick that up and be more strategic in outlook and selection.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for the question Robert. There are two parts to my answer. One is the identification of need, including diversity, is done, but it's done from the receiving organizations with specific advice to us. That's a model that I'm kind of okay defending. We will discuss it fully and frankly in our two days together.

There certainly would be merit in a holistic and external review and report, but part of me thinks about whether or not the better value for that to be positioned would be just prior to a review. There are some pluses and minuses there, and let's talk about that. In terms of the diversity, regardless of what type we're talking about, when you get your cards it will say on the bottom, "Geographic, gender and cultural diversity."

These are aspirations. They really have to be aspirations, because we're still talking about a meritocracy. First of all, we do have a limitation to be only able to appoint from the pool we get, and if we only get 2% females from East Asia, we only get 2% females from East Asia. So even

if that was a desirable characteristic of an appointee to a support organization...

An SO might have said, "We really want more females on our Council and we'd love to have more input geographically from Central Asia," if we get that sort of person in the puddle, that's great, but they would still have to be the best person for the job. We can't, at this stage, justify diversity for diversity's sake, and that sticks in my craw incredibly as some of you may notice as a little bit of a pusher of female improvement and gender equity.

Unless we've got the talent in the pool, we can't push them up through the right places. There's no place for affirmative action here, but that is where having the report done at the right time would be really valuable. You've got a follow on? Go ahead.

ROBERT GUERRA:

Just a quick follow up. I'm curious if the NomCom actually gives recommendations to the Fellowship Committee or others in terms of if there's a gap that's been identified, perhaps because a certain pool can't be identified, to then provide some advice in terms of other efforts ICANN does, to try to promote, engage, support and build up those sectors so they could then apply at a later stage.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Currently we particularly don't, other than in our interactions with them, which we do have at the meetings. When Fellowship gather at any time we always do present and so we do specific outreach, but that's only actually using the network they've got

around the table. It's not advising Fellowship how they could be more diverse and useful to us in who they put around the table. So that's a yes. I think we should look into that and follow that up.

We also need to extend – and this is something that I think we should rely on each and every one of you, and the networks you have influence over – to look for more of these opportunities to bring people in from outside. I know Veronica's done particular work, and I'm going to ask her to share, and some of the others who've been involved in outreach last time, on where we went and what we did. It doesn't really matter what measure of success we had. We still need to just all do better.

I for example have been pushing very much the women in the boardroom, women on boards, the already trained governance accredited sub-set of people who we clearly need to encourage to put in their SOIs. But there's got to be a lot more. We've clearly got to have more out of Africa. We've clearly got to have a great deal more out of Central Asia and certainly out of Western Asia.

I could go on about small islands and developing states until the cows come home, and that's not even touching language diversity. So there are a lot, but let's also remember that there is a review. I believe it's only between 12 and 18 months away, and getting things timed right for that review might be really, really useful.

SPEAKER:

I would [inaudible 00:46:49] NARALO. I was referring to the question that you were answering, so there's a little gap here. my understanding

is that 2013 has to provide knowledge transfer and best practices for 2014. This is what I want to summarize.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Louis], thanks for that. I think that's a very good way of putting it forward, but we will be able to have further conversation in our kick-off meeting as we go through. We need to recognize that these are simply recommendations, and as I think Veronica alluded to, there may be some that may not need to necessarily be adopted in the manner in which they've been written.

That's okay too. We do have to go through that, but you do have the benefit of course of having people who've served on one to the other. Go ahead Stéphane.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: There are two points I want to make quickly. The first, just to echo some of what's been said, is to remind everyone that each NomCom coming in basically makes up its rules. This is the right time to have these discussions as well, and the 2014 Chair, supported by her Leadership Team, will be able to set some different rules if she so wishes, supported by the Committee, to answer some of the problems or issues that have been encountered in the past.

I make that point because it's actually a great... I think it's a very positive management leeway that's afforded the NomCom. If you look around different bodies within ICANN, not many have that leeway, so it's a good thing to have. The other point I just wanted to make, with regards to

this kind of discussion, is just to echo what Ron said earlier about the mindset with which the 2013 Committee worked.

I think that mindset, as Ron said, was evident from the kick-off meeting. So that's happening this Friday for the new Committee. I think it is worth spending five seconds to stress that again. The Committee worked as one. You won't find anyone on last year's Committee that disagrees. I served on the NomCom for the first time last year, so I don't have any experience of what went on before, but I obviously talked to people who do.

It was very clear that last year's Committee was a change. It was a change of atmosphere and it was a change of both the quality of the work during the Committee and the productivity results that came from that. So I really hope that that can be carried forward. As Ron said, it's a decision that we can all take to start with, to leave our bags at the door, as it were, and work together.

SPEAKER:

I'm [inaudible 00:50:22] coming from Finland. I'm here from the ccNSO. Actually I have a question regarding this first recommendation. This wishes to further develop the transparency and openness of the NomCom, while taking into account its confidentiality and all the things you've done during this past period. I just wondered what's still left, and what we can do in order to improve this transparency?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm willing to take up that challenge, but I'll be taking some of you, including you, [Johan Prabang? 00:51:00] with me. One of the things

we're already doing is in fact having the level of conversation and the granularity in the topics now, and this is a public meeting. This would not have happened this time last year, so I'd like to think that we can build on these experiences.

We do need to also make sure that everyone is really clear about when we put our Code of Conduct together, how much time we'll be taking to go through and understand exactly what each thing means, and particularly the confidentiality aspect of it. There are some things that we will discuss when we're in-camera over our two days at the end, which may be tools and skills that older and more experienced NomCommers can pass on, to make sure we don't become entrapped or compromised in any way.

I'll say now, and I'll keep saying it at regular intervals, you as the outgoing 2013 have clearly shown a great ability to put some superb candidates, and they really are superb candidates, into these leadership positions. But we as the 2014 need to be proud of what we do at the end of our term. That's going to include making sure every one of us is comfortable not only with our own performance, but with each other's. Go ahead Bill.

BILL MANNING:

There is a delicate tension between transparency and confidentiality, and we are not entirely free to set our own rules. We are bound within the context of the ICANN bylaws and the ICANN non-disclosure agreements, which we must sign before we can participate. That being said, there is an interesting situation that's occurred in the past, which in 2013 did not experience. That was a potential candidate going public.

If an applicant goes public, they go public, and there's nothing we can do about what they say. So we have to be very careful in our communications about our applicants, and our discussions, and ensure that there is a veil drawn across, so that any of our deliberations that become public will not disclose the applicants.

Anyway, it's an interesting and very difficult situation when an applicant starts publicly releasing information about the NomCom process that should, from their perspective, be confidential.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's an interesting dance. One I think we will hopefully not have to experience too often, but we should have a bit of practice in case. Go ahead Ron.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you very much. Just responding to your question on how we could be more transparent, it is true – we really are quite transparent now. It's hard to think about how we could be more so, but different groups and different bodies sent us here. We should all be socializing within our groups. We have NomCom meetings. They're open. Make sure you put that on your agenda so you can come and hear and learn.

I think that as that starts to... Obviously there's lots of work going on and this is probably the least important thing for many, but it may be important for others just to come and sit in on one and to grasp where we're going with this thing. They could get a level of confidence or comfort with it that they can then go out and share with colleagues and

friends on, "You might want to put your name in for this thing," or whatever.

I think that's a way we could go. That's something we haven't yet done. We've got them on the meeting schedule and I think we said it was wide open – we publicized it's an open meeting – and that's a way to do it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

There's even arrows on stickers downstairs pointing, "It's upstairs!" I refuse to wear a t-shirt to advertise it. I will go so far as carrying a coffee cup that has it on, but we can just promote, you're right. A lot of people unfortunately, Ron, if I may, still assume that they know what goes on and that their view is right. There has been massive, rapid and I think rewarding change, and we've all got to get out there, as he said, and just push that fact of, "Come and have another look."

Because we really do need to give credit where credit's due to the 2013, and you've done an amazing job of opening up. It's not comfortable to do that, you know? Change is not always easy and you've managed this one extremely well.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Adam please.

ADAM PEAKE:

if I apply next year and put in my SOI, and then I put it on a blog, and to be honest as a Committee I wouldn't care if I were you, it doesn't

matter. The only thing you can't do is acknowledge it. You can't say that I am a candidate and you can't say that I'm not. You can just say...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can neither confirm or deny.

ADAM PEAKE: It just is what it is. I wouldn't worry too much about that. It's just part of what people do, and we have Facebook pages and we Tweet all kinds of things. There are some ridiculous photographs of me around, so I wouldn't worry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd add those into your SOI.

ADAM PEAKE: The world is very public these days, so I don't think you have to worry too much, it's just very difficult for you to acknowledge it. On another matter completely – I'm not going to put in an SOI – one thing that disappoints me, as someone who's been involved in Nominating Committees for a long time, so this is not to do with my current membership on the Committee, is that the constituencies, I feel, still do not help NomComs as much as they should do.

I don't think that they really understand that they should be a major source of candidates. I think they drop you people into this and then somewhat forget about you. I don't know how to change that because it's always been so. It is disappointing that they know people, and I

don't think they really tell you, and I don't think they help you as much as they ought to.

So if there's anything you can do to change that for 2014, that would probably be one of the greatest potential changes you could institute – getting the constituencies to use their rolodexes of good people more than they currently do.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Stéphane.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Thanks. One of the things the Leadership Team of the old or the new year... Some of us met yesterday with two groups, and one of the things I said in both meetings, which is linked with what Adam's just said, is that last year I feel that we worked heavily on transparency. I think that this year we must add working on a community involvement, outreach, and making sure the community itself feels engaged.

I think the right word is probably 'engagement'. That the community feels engaged with the NomCom process, and wants to engage with the NomCom process. I think it's absolutely right that transparency boosts that desire and makes it easier to kick the doors open, come in and suggest and suggest people and changes, and just be aware of what's going on.

But I think engagement is key, and I'd add that I don't think we started off very well by doing that, because even though the view is superb, having a meeting so remote from the rest of what's going on, I have to

wonder if that's a way of making sure that people engage. This is our open meeting and it's on the top of the building and nobody knows where it is – even though Cheryl's wearing the t-shirt.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Stéphane. I think that's a matter to take up with Meetings, because the allocation is an art, and a black art indeed.

SARAH DEUTSCH: This is a somewhat difficult question, but I'm passing it on because someone asked me to ask it of the NomCom. This is somebody who apparently applied in the past, got to a certain level, then didn't hear back. They then understands that their SOI will roll again into... They said, "Do you want your SOI to be considered again?" and the answer was yes.

This person wanted to know, "How do I know whether I'm wasting my time? Should I just withdraw it at a certain point? I don't want to waste the NomCom's time." So this may be a transparency or feedback question, but is there a process for... They're encouraging, discouraging or just staying neutral depending on the numbers, etc?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you. The unsuccessful candidates are asked afterwards if they want to be candidates next year. If they say yes, their data stays in the system. However, there is something that we perhaps have to discuss Friday and Saturday, and that's whether it's enough, or should they send in a new SOI? This depends on whether the SOI form is changed from

year-to-year, as they usually are. There are usually some improvements. Again, to have all the candidates on the same level, in those cases we have to ask for a new SOI.

SPEAKER: While the candidate may be... While Adam may in fact have his SOI renewed, because we rejected him last year, we have a new NomCom, and for a substantial number of the NomCom members, we've never seen Adam's SOI before, so while it may be a refresh for Adam, it's new to the rest of us.

So that perspective is sometimes lost on the potential applicant; that the NomCom itself has changed and we don't have the institutional memory of what happened the previous year, and why Adam was rejected at the time for whatever reason. We don't know that coming into it. So 2014 has no idea why we threw Adam out last year. So when he comes back this year he may be a perfect fit. That's because Adam said that he's not going to turn in an SOI and I'm going to make sure he doesn't.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay, yes?

SPEAKER: [inaudible 01:03:04] from the Address Supporting Organization. I think what we're touching on here is the same challenge that we have in recruitment process. The engagement and outreach, our most important targets are the candidates we turn down. We need them to feel so good and professionally handled...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, yes.

SPEAKER: ...That they will recommend to their friends and their network to apply in the future. I think that's probably, without knowing the process but from hearing in the corridors, where there's room for improvement. To give clear feedback so they know that if they try again they will be professionally handled then as well.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yes. The engagement... I think that's a logical next step from transparency. It's necessary to open the black box first, and now when it's open we can actually start engaging the community in the work. Let me just say that we may have all sorts of criteria and advice from people who tell us what kind of selectees they'd like to have on the Board, and SO Councils and so on and so forth, but without the candidate pool we can't do anything.

We're not manufacturing these people to certain specifications – 50cm and whatever. Even though we are probably going to get pretty precise information this time from the Board, still, everything depends on the candidate pool. Basically our work... We build it step by step, and if the recruitment and engagement and outreach is not done properly, then the next layers are shaky also. Yes, please.

SPEAKER: Thank you. Sarah, in direct response to this individual, I think the one other element that's important, apart from what's just been said, is that we recognize that every year we're looking for different criteria. For example, on the Board last year we said, "We've got hundreds of millions of dollars, who has experience with being on boards with hundreds of millions of dollars?" That was one of the criteria.

Now we might say, "Boy, in light of Brazil we need governance." So there may be different qualifications. That individual may have been a round peg in a square hole at that time, but might be a perfect fit this time. So that would be what I would... If I were asked that question, that's how I would respond. It really is a moving target year by year, in all positions.

One time for ccNSO we had a very good writer, it was a lawyer. They were gone and they needed another writer, a drafter. So there's always a different requirement and that's an important point, I think.

SARAH DEUTSCH: That's really helpful, and I can't remember whether we send a thank you letter or something personal to each of the applicants, but that might help things as well; to thank them and...

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: This is Fatimata Seye Sylla from ALAC. I have two points. The first one I think Ron gave a good answer to, because I was a little bit confused about when we have good candidates... When Cheryl and Yrjö were explaining yesterday to the other constituencies, that we don't want to

lose the good candidates we have, what are we going to do not to lose them?

Then the question from Sarah saying that, "Here's one applicant. Who thought that the application was good and doesn't know what to do next? Should I reapply? Should I wait for you to tell me what to do?" If we don't have the data, we're supposed to destroy the data, so I'm kind of...

The second one is about outreach within our constituencies, as Adam pointed out. It's true that when we're within our constituencies we don't really think NomCom. We don't think... NomCom will come in the room and talk to us, and then ask us to outreach, and then we'll do something maybe during the ICANN meeting and after that we forget everything about it.

So I was thinking that maybe one opportunity would be to use this CROP Program, within the regions, and see what we can do in terms of outreaching within each region.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you.

JOHN [MCCLOIN]: John [McCloin? 01:08:26]. As many people know, I filled in for Jay Scott-Evans, so forgive me for not knowing the answer for this and asking a question about the 2013 process. Did we make public the needs analysis, gap analysis, that the Board provided to us to the...? Okay,

because I think that that's a great idea, because it should help, to some extent, from outreach.

If I were looking for a job I'd want to apply for one that I was clearly fitting the qualifications for, so that should help. It might also help in Sarah's situation, where somebody is trying to decide whether they should put themselves back up and they can look at those qualifications. I think that would be a really big, important thing to do – to really get that out publicly.

SPEAKER:

If I may? John, I think that's a very good idea, but what just struck me... The BCG gave us Board qualifications, and I think we got it from the ccNSO? From everybody. So as long as it covers across the board I think that's a very helpful idea, no question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm going to say it is on the site. Each year they've been on the site, but the question that you've raised, Sarah, is when you've already put in an application for one year, we need to find a way to say, "By the way, look what's happened for the coming year." If things have changed, people who may wish to continue need to know about that. So perhaps we need a way to get people to look at the site.

It's not the homepage for everyone. Exactly, the newsletter will help, but it's not the homepage for everyone outside of the community. A lot of the people we're talking about may in fact be outside the community. Fatimata, you were right, we do not, unless we are NomCom, think NomCom first, and that is an issue.

With the gap analysis question however, something came up that we may discuss further on the weekend, this morning, in the leadership discussion with the Board Governance Committee. They were wondering, and whilst this may become a matter for a future review issue, rather than something for us to grapple with, we could have a little think about what we might do about this.

Is there a way to collect unidentified, in other words all personal information has been removed, but start building a set of 'this year we have this type, we looked for this and we got that' happening. That may be the beginning of a body of work or knowledge that could benefit future NomComs.

So it seems to me that you're all talking pretty much the same language as they're wanting to talk about as well, which I think is a good thing. It sounds like we're heading in the right direction. Thank you.

SPEAKER:

I'm still thinking about it. You're making it much harder than previous years. Going to the point about returning candidates, this is the time of year when the Chair will be writing to the unsuccessful candidates and saying, "Would you like to have your SOI considered by the 2014?" and that sort of thing.

So thinking about what Sarah was saying, you could add the candidate profile that you develop over the weekend and add that to the letter so they know... There's no reason why you can't continue the process of communicating with them, because normally it's just a one-time shot. But these were people who've spent... When I write my SOI I'm going to

spend quite a lot of time doing that. It's not an easy thing to put together. So communicate with me a few more times, perhaps.

Returning candidates are actually... They may not know this but I know there are at least two, or it might be three Board Members, who were not successful the first time. There are people sitting on that Board who went through NomComs more than one time. So this is a legitimate process of having your SOI considered again, and it does lead to success because NomComs look at things differently.

So that could be a message that could be got out a little bit more perhaps. I don't know. I think it's really a matter of communication with the candidates in ways that previous NomComs have not been confident enough to do. This is all about... The NomCom has become, I think, more confident in its ability to be open with people.

This is what you Committee last year did, Yrjö. You've made it more open, so continue that openness and the candidates may feel more comfortable. Communicate with them more, when in the past we've been somewhat reluctant to do so.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Thanks. One of the ways that we can ensure we hold onto quality candidates that are unsuccessful in one round, is also to remember that in many instances we are the first members of the ICANN community that they'll meet. They meet us either through our processes or face-to-face if they get to that stage of the process. They meet us in circumstances that can be quite daunting.

So I think it's also worth remembering that we are often the first ambassadors of the ICANN community to some very high-level people, and I think it's also important for us to behave in a way that gives them the desire to continue to apply for these processes, and maybe to resubmit. One concrete suggestion that we can make in that regard, is to seek training for the way we handle the candidate interviews, or the way we handle the candidate processes.

We are not recruitment professionals, and it's easy to do something wrong in that kind... I'm not saying that was done last year. I think... Yes. That's why I'm stressing it.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Any more comments, questions? Yes, Veronica please.

VERONICA CRETU:

Very quickly, I think in the upcoming 2014 Committee we should also try to be more creative and innovative in the way we share and present information. We talk about openness and transparency, which are two very important values and principles, but at the same time to get more attention and interest...

I remember before Durban I was trying to put some charts presenting the gender balance, the regional distribution of the candidates and I think these sorts of visual tools would really help the broader community to understand where we are, what we have and how that can be something that can be balanced in the future. You can actually provide a picture of, "This is the region where the Committee is missing candidates," or, "These are the gender gaps," or...

So we are going to help the community at large to be able to bring in more input. Because at the end of the day we get what we give, so the more we innovate and create and make the information user-friendly, the more likely it is we're going to have a positive response and contribution and input from the community. Maybe this is one of the aspects we also have to discuss on Friday and Saturday; how we innovate with that. Thank you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you. I want to thank you for all the suggestions and innovative proposals you made during 2013. Maybe not all were implemented, but now there's another chance.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll see.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay. Any more? If not...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are there any questions from the floor? Not that I saw.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you. Do you want to have some closing words for this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to give everybody 12 minutes of your life back. It might be the last extra time you'll get until this time next year. Thank you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you very much. Thank you. We're still recording, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll close the call. Close the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]