
HYDERABAD – 2016 Nominating Committee Public Meeting
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 11:00 to 12:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

THOMAS BARRETT: ...the process, in terms of recruitment and evaluation is going to be from start to finish, and so they understand clearly once they proceed through one step what the next step is going to be. And we are constantly communicating to them what that process is.

It helps us come across as being more professional. It helps us attract a higher caliber of candidates who have achieved that level in their career, and that's pretty much summarized here in recommendation 6.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much, Tom. Questions? Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I would like to just raise one point when selecting vendors because it's not so easy to have vendors that have an easy way to touch the south – so Latin America, Africa, and some Asia areas that are not easily to be –

They don't have branches there and sometimes the connection is difficult. So just pay attention when you select the vendors.

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.

They need to really be able to interview, reach people with some facility, have maybe branches around to make it easier. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you. One thing that I find perhaps missing in this list is gender and other kinds of diversity. The fact that we only had about 20-something percentage of women in the last year is worrying, and the fact that it does not appear in this list makes it look as if that's not sufficiently important.

Now, post-transition we are all very much about diversity, and the absence of gender in this list is a little bit kind of a problem. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Zahid, quick.

ZAHID JAMIL: I agree with you, Satish. You're absolutely right. It was something that we were concerned about. The reason that you don't see recommendations specifically is because it's difficult

to say how we're going to make sure that there are more women. It's a difficult recommendation to come up with.

However, what was really, clearly noted by the NomCom last year was that we need to do something about this and get our message out. So that's why, literally, every talking point – and you heard Stéphane very correctly – he opened with this point saying, “There weren't enough women.” We acknowledged it and that's going to be part of our talking points.

But we really have some challenges trying to figure out how do we improve that apart from reaching out to women's groups, etc. That's one idea, but really what do we do here. Bruce has an answer, maybe.

BRUCE TONKIN:

I don't have an answer, just an observation. As a board member, I've been attending a range of different meetings this week and I would say the NomCom itself seems to have one of the lowest ratios of female on the NomCom. When I looked at the 2017 list, and I may not be able to [parse] the name agenda visually, but at a quick glance it looked like 1 out of 20. So maybe a starting point is ask for a bit of gender diversity in the appointments to the Nominating Committee from the relevant respective parties as a starting point.

Then I noticed you only had 20% applications from the female gender, and I'm guessing the Nominating Committee itself uses a bit of its own network. But just be conscious of it yourselves when you're going and encouraging people to apply, really think of what females that you personally know, and encourage them to apply.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. All right. So trying to speed up the — then I'll walk through the Recommendations. The numbering has a bit of an issue there, but — the second number 6 is — if I can explain that very quickly. The first step in our recruitment process is to ask the groups that we're recruiting to what they need. So we get skill sets from them – or skill recommendations or requests for skill sets from them.

In the past, we've, at times, observed those skill sets have been less precise or less complete or not sufficiently detailed enough for the NomCom to work with from the other groups. It's not always been the case and we're not trying to single anyone out, but we did want to recommend to 2017 that meetings be set up with the other groups to ensure that we understand what they need.

Part of that is also to highlight the fact that the NomCom is not all about board recruitment because many times people feel

that their only interest, their only focus is on the Board. The statistics I gave you earlier on, a lot of the people who applied for the GNSO or the ccNSO were applying as second choices but they also applied for the board.

People who actually have, as their primary focus, ALAC, GNSO, or ccNSO tend to be rare in our process, and I think it's incumbent on us as recruiters – or evaluators or whatever we are – that we reinforcement the importance of those groups. And they are excellent ways into ICANN work as well. For people that maybe are coming to ICANN or the NomCom process for the first time, it's often a better idea to look at ALAC, GNSO, and ccNSO rather than aim for the board directly. It's a good way into the process.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. This is Eduardo. I have two points. One is, eventually this recommendation, we need to the PTI going forward at some point. I have a question about PTI for the current leadership in the next [search] for the NomCom. It's how do we look for the skill for PTI. Will you look at what PTI is all about, right? Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. So these recommendations — PTI is a very new situation which we had limited knowledge of when we drafted these recommendations. Two days ago I attended another meeting, I think it was with the GNSO, and the PTI Chair or president – I don't know what her position was exactly because I can't remember – was giving an overview of the PTI and I spoke at the mic and suggested that they think of giving us skill sets for the two positions that we are going to recruit to. I know that Hans Petter is looking at this as well. I don't know if you want to – no. So we're looking at that.

Okay. So continuing through. One of the things that we do – and we've talked about this already – is outreach. It's very important for us to go and get the message out to as many people as we can that the NomCom exists, the ICANN exists in many instances, and that we have a process for people to apply to these leadership positions.

One of the things that we're looking for is reinforcement or support from the Board in doing that. So perhaps one idea that we had was that the people that we appoint to the Board could come in – unfortunately, that doesn't seem to be the case today – but could come in and speak during either our public meetings or even other meetings and perhaps give people an insight into their own experiences – NomCom applicants and successful applicants.

Just looking around the room. No comments. Sorry. Dave?

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: Yes. Usually, with all NomComs we get recommendations from the Board – okay, what are the skill sets that the Nominating Committee should be looking for? But I think on top of this, what would be very helpful is that the Board sends us the current skill set of all Board members. If we can get the skill sets of all Board members, then this will be very helpful in the selection of the future Board Members. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Dave. Okay.

Number 8 is a process issue for us. I'm not going to dwell on it. We have Wiki page and we store as much as we can on it. It's a recommendation to augment that.

Number 9 is really linked to what we just discussed. We are looking for as much information as we can to understand what's needed and what's expected of a Board member when we come to make our selections. Any questions on that?

Number 10 is something that Tom has already spoken to. We are looking at building surveys that will help us understand the

process a little more and give us more information into the process.

Number 11 is also something that deals with us getting as much information as we can about the candidates themselves and using the recruitment firm – sorry, the assessment firm that we use, if we decide to use one – to give us that information. So we’re back to the standard numbering now.

Number 13 is — so the scorecard is something that we use during the assessment process. This year’s committee found that some of the information — there was a limited amount of information on the scorecard and is looking for more information or a better account of the history from the scorecard. So that recommendation addresses that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Stéphane? The scorecard, is it from the vendor or from ourselves?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: We don’t do a scorecard. The scorecard is done by the vendor. Anyone else? Okay.

Number 14. We are thinking that we would like to have more information from the leadership of the Board — sorry, the

groups that we recruit to – so Board GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC. And this, again, is part of the process of getting better, more detailed feedback from them on what they're looking for and what we should be looking for in our recruitment process.

The one thing that I may not have mentioned, the NomCom leadership is reviewed every year by an external reviewer. So they go and ask the people that we work with, the NomCom membership, and the staff, what they thought of us in our performance as NomCom leaders. We use an external firm to do that, and part of that process, we felt in 2016, could be tweaked so the recommendation there addresses that.

Number 16 is something that we've already discussed, about passing on past documents that aren't confidential to future NomComs.

Number 17 is a recommendation to continue working on our own assessments after we've done the main part of our work, which is recruitment and selection.

Lastly, number 18 is something that – a question that came up this year about exactly how much financial support the NomCom gets in terms of budgets and what the NomCom costs, what budget lines are available to the NomCom to do its work. And we realized that information on those aspects was completely lacking to the NomCom itself.

So we suggest – and I don't know if Hans Petter, you've put that up – but starting from the kickoff, which is the first time a new NomCom meets, which happens in two days' time. So it happens at the end of every AGM. The new incoming NomCom meets for a couple of days to set out, basically, the roadmap for its work during the cycle. We suggest that those aspects be looked at during the kickoff.

So those are the recommendations. Let me pause there and ask if there are any general comments or questions. Okay. Hans?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Well, I just want to thank you, Stéphane, for compiling this list of excellent recommendations to the NomCom. And the NomCom will, of course, discuss this in our kickoff meeting and, hopefully, adopt all of them as a basis for our work going forward.

STÉPHANE VEN GELDER: Thank you very much. Okay. So the last thing that we wanted to talk about today is something that's extremely important to us, and that is the review. There is a bylaw mandated review process within ICANN for all the ICANN entities, bodies, or groups or whatever they're called. That process is now upon the NomCom.

As part of the review process, in recent reviews, it's been decided that there be an intermediate group that be formed to act as liaison between, basically, the community and the entity doing the review. Obviously, the review itself is done by an external entity. It wouldn't be right to have a review done by someone that's – by the people themselves. So an external reviewer is hired to do a review of whatever it is, whatever body that we're talking about.

In the case of the NomCom, that external review has not been hired yet, but the initial step was to create a working party, as we call it, which is a group of people that are tasked with making sure that not only the reviewer has as much information about the NomCom as possible, but the review itself is – it takes into account all the elements that the community wants to make sure get looked at during the review.

So the Working Party has been formed. I've been asked to Chair it. We have two Vice Chairs. Tom is one. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is another. So I was just looking at the experience there that you have throughout the Working Party membership. As you can see, there are many people in the Working Party that have either served on past NomComs as members or as leadership team members, or have served in other capacities in ICANN groups.

The idea, obviously, is to get as much past experience into the review process as possible, so the Review Party membership is done in that way. The NomCom 2016 put out, whatever it was called, an RFP or whatever, for volunteers to the review process and these are – we retained everyone that volunteered. So all the people that volunteered are up on the screen. I don't think there's a second page. Is there? No. They are up on the screen.

The way the review is going to work is it's going to happen in 2017. There's an RFP that's being drafted now to put out a call for independent reviewers. The Working Party is having input into that RFP, and we'll have input – once selection has been made – into welcoming and, I guess, educating the reviewer on the NomCom itself. The reviewer will probably sit in to some of your meetings, Hans Petter, during the year to understand what the NomCom does and how it does it.

Obviously, we're looking at people – an external company – that will sign an NDA and that will abide by the same confidentiality rules as NomCom members. Then they will through, their own work – interviews with past and existing NomCom members and other Community members – come up with a set of, I guess, recommendations or a report.

We will look at that report with them and it will go through several iterations from draft to final. Once the report is finalized,

then it will be submitted. And from that point on, it's up to the ICANN Board to take up some of these recommendations or not.

So that's an outline of the process. Once again, it's an extremely important process for the NomCom. If we go back to the way the NomCom is structured at that moment, as you can see from these different color-coded boxes, the NomCom is a representation of the ICANN Community, but it's one that has been in place for a while now. And without wanting to preempt any outcome of the review itself, once a process is in place for a while, you may need to look at it and see if it's still fit for purpose.

On the screen in front of you, you can see that ALAC has good representation on the NomCom. The GNSO Community has good representation on the NomCom. We have smaller representation from the ccNSO and the technical community. That representation is not always equal, so some of the technical community members – the ones in the light blue boxes – are nonvoting, and some are voting.

Then there's a seat on the NomCom for the GAC, but that seat has not been filled, certainly, since I've been involved with the NomCom, which is since 2013. I don't think it was filled much before that, looking at some of these. It was once, was it? Okay. So it was filled once, so that's obviously a problem. You had the

leadership team structure also, which may or may not need looking at.

So one of the aspects of the review, obviously, is the NomCom structure. Right fit for purpose. Should it be kept as is? Should be evolved, changed? Another thing that we expect the review to look at is the terms of both membership and leadership.

Currently, as I said before, these are one-year terms. Exceptionally, I served two years as Chair, but that's generally not the way it's done. When we look at terms and term lengths, obviously, there are aspects to that of experience, of previous knowledge, but also of letting — making sure that new people can come in and participate.

It's always a tradeoff between the term being too short for experience to be passed over and the term being too long for new people to be able to come in. I think, currently, I can safely say that we're playing it very safe as far as letting new people in because you can't have much shorter than the one year term. So perhaps those elements need to be looked at again.

The review will be looking at other things, and if you have suggestions for the review or what should be looked at, then please do make them. If you want to make them now, please do so because I'm certainly sick of hearing my own voice. I don't know if you are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can we have the timeframe for the review, the draft, and the recommendations?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: You can when they're ready. I don't think the timeframe is — I've seen a roadmap, but I don't think it's fully set yet. So beyond saying what I've just said, which is that the review is planned to happen in 2017, is expected to complete — is it at the AGM, 2017, [inaudible] — I forget about that. Do you want to speak to some of this? Okay.

Anyone else want to say anything on the review or suggestions for what should be looked at? Do you want to say anything?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Well, if you're hinting that we should close off, I could thank you for your excellent work as Chair this year, and thank you also very much for saying yes to become Associate Chair for next year so that I can draw on your experience and, hopefully, not make your mistakes. Then, if anybody is then dissatisfied with my way of chairing the NomCom, you can give advice Zahid so that he don't make those mistakes next year.

ZAHID JAMIL: I just wanted to add, thank you Stéphane for making us a model that the rest of the Community adopts.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much and it's a pleasure to be working alongside you both next year. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I just wanted to say on behalf of the NomCom, thank you, all three of you for your leadership. It's probably a thankless job, but we really do appreciate your leadership in herding the cats that are a member of the Community.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Thank you very much.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Well, that's probably a good way to end, and what better way to end then 10 minutes early. Enjoy lunch.

Thank you very much for being here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]