EN

LOS ANGELES – 2014 Nominating Committee Public Meeting
Thursday, October 16, 2014 – 10:00 to 10:30
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ladies and gentlemen, it is the top of the hour, and I fear that our public meeting will be a very private one, but that's all right. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Gee, some of you might know me. And for the first half hour today, oh! We have public. Thank you. Join us at the table. Come on.

This is, no, none of this hiding behind the scenes. Come along.

Is it 10:00 now? I think it is appropriate for me to note, but not to actually ask you to, I believe it is at 10:00 today that this state, county, or whatever I'm in, California, is running its largest ever, earthquake preparedness exercise.

So I should remind you that if you live in this area, you should have a well-established plan and preparation for such activities. And there is somebody who lives here, drop something and cover. Drop, cover, and whatever. There is stuff you're supposed to do, including sitting inside of doors.

It's the earthquake preparedness, no, now 10:00. Right this second. So if we weren't anywhere else, I suspect there would be people who would be going through these exercises. It's all about raising awareness for when the big one happens. So I know there is locals in the room, and I just wanted to mark that moment, because prior planning does prevent really insert whatever [inaudible] your prefer, poor performance.

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.

And doing these sorts of exercises is vital. Please feel free to come and sit at the table. I get paranoid with people behind me, well actually, I don't. It sounds good if I say that. Today's short, albeit, meeting is our public meeting that since 2013, we've undertaken to have, and to perform a normal meeting at an ICANN meeting where the public is welcomed.

Today's one is slightly more special, because today's one where we actually deliver our report to the community. And I would like to just check with staff, if it has been published yet, or if not, when it will be.

Great. So that's just confirming. Joette has just told us that both the report, our yearend report on our activities, which you've all had a chance to read, and our, and the 360 reviews, or peer reviews, have been published this morning. We had only a few edits suggested, and I want to thank everybody from the committee who did make any edits and proposals to the final meeting, say it again Cheryl.

To the final report from the 2014 NomCom, all of those edits were adopted. Thank you very much. And so you'll notice some of your words from where you've sent them, they've just been inserted in. I don't think anything that was suggested didn't make the cut.

Now, I'm filler busting until I see the slide set coming up. And that's all right. I can filler buster a little bit longer. And I wanted to just suggest that please, feel free to come and sit at the table. This is an open meeting, we're more than happy…

Look, there is people down there. I can look directly at you if you wanted to sit down there. One of the things that we are trying to do

today is briefly, and for the public record, report on the extraordinary good work that you all did, referring here to those of you in the 2014 nominating committee. And any brief moment, there we go, that will do us.

I'll work with that. So the slide deck is an integral part of the final report, so it will be linked to the final report. And as it says, it outlines, and, oh God… That doesn't help. The task given to us, what the two members that we had to put onto the Board, the two members that we… Thank you. Gave to the At-Large advisory committee, the one member to the Council of the Generic Name support organization, and the one member of the Council of Country Code names support organization was our primary task.

Next slide please. Thank you. I've outlined all of you, and seeing as you're also friendly with each other and work so well, I've bolded your first names, because I thought that made us look friendly as a 2014 nominating committee.   And I want to also note here that unfortunately, a few members were either unable to attend the Los Angeles meeting at all because of other work commitments, otherwise they would be here.

We would note their apologies formally, thank you ladies. And of course, one or two people have either got competing meetings, I think Russ is actually chairing something else now, or that they are, because of their travel, I think somebody is, you know, over the Atlantic or the Pacific at this time. So any member that is not sitting around this table, your apologies have indeed been noted.

And for the sake of the public, because this is a public meeting, when you talk, I expect some of you will be talking shortly, please just identify yourself. And so Robert will say, "I'm Robert from SSAC," that you saw on that slide. Okay? Next slide please.

What I thought I'd also point out is something that you all know that Stephan and I and Yurjö are very proud of, and that's the fact that we've taken our external peer reviews, and put them in the public regime. It was a brave, brave act as we've decided retrospectively, no, no we're only joking.

It was decided, well before we were even reviewed, that we would be making it public. And we'd like to think that the 2015 nominating committee would seriously considering the leadership there to do the same thing. And of course, your internal peer review process, I think, has been a very important piece of reporting back to your sending communities. And there is the aggregated image that you will see in just one moment, that is from the report, so you've all seen it, that I have included in this slide deck.

So if I can have the next slide, thank you. And just take a moment to look, right? The top mark, ladies and gentlemen, that you could have given each other was five. That would have been perfection across all seven questions. You're all ranking each other on the seven qualities that we would expect for good, collegial, effective, and trustworthy operation. Very, very highly. And I want to say, for the public record, this is not a friendly artifact. This is a really valid representation of how you all work together, and how you all managed as a team.

I was, as Yurjö, and Ron, and Stephan and I have done the, as some of you came to some of the meetings on Tuesday, what I would like to call the roadshow, where we visited as many constituencies who could fit us into their agenda, we were asked and challenged in some of those rooms. Are these peer review things just people too afraid to not say brutally honest things about each other?

And we were able to say no, that's not the case. And what they've said, which is good, is valid. So that's something that, again, 2015 might want to keep a wither eye on. Next slide please. Okay. You know what we did, but let's read it to the record.

We continue to build on the excellent changes implemented by the 2013 NomCom relating to greater transparency and accountability, and by having more open meetings and regular reporting to the community, we up the game. I can, if I had my crystal ball here, I would predict that the 2015 team will be able to report something fairly similar, that they would have upped the game yet again.

We implemented a new application process, an online wiki based one. We received our 58 statements of interest, and of course, we only had six ICANN leadership positions to fill. And we note that from those 58 statements, several candidates, did in fact, wish to be considered for more than one question. And we announced, and that's a live link, who we've appointed on the 15th of August.

Now this is the boring bit done, and I like what follows. Can I have the next slide please? Ah, thank heavens, they actually turned out all right. So often you wait to see what your charts look like in someone else's process system. It's always terrifying. Okay.

This is some regional diversity breakdowns of the 58 that we got. And I would like to think that this is the type of visual imagery which will help people have a quick flick through, have a look and see where, for example, outreach in 2015 might need to be focused.

The statements of interest, this is just the 58 regardless of what they were applying for. On the left hand side I've shown, according to the key, the majority were in fact, coming in from… I'll try to see it at that distance. It is, in fact, North America, right? But we've got a quite reasonable amount coming in from Asia PAC. A quite reasonable coming in from Africa. And probably far too few from Europe.

And indeed, not sufficiently large from Latin America and Caribbean. What, in a perfect world, you would like to see is a far more balanced dome up there. But remember, if you're on the NomCom for 2015, but please know, if you are here, hearing what we did, and I would like to say how well we did, is that we were specifically tasked to bring in more from Africa and Asia Pacific.

So that's ticker box time ladies and gentlemen. We were asked to bring in significantly more numbers from APAC, and from Africa, and you delivered. Well done. Gender, on the right. Does anybody know what the ratio of male and female is in the world? Astonishingly, it's almost equal. I know, it's astonishingly. It's not quite 50/50, but it's almost equal.

Which means we've [laughter]… Which means this business of the little blue bit being the female applicants out of the 58, and the big orange part of the dome, being the male applicants out of the 58. There is work to be done, in terms of gender diversity. We've done better, don't

get me wrong. This is not as bad as it could have been, but we still have some benchmarks that need to be hit.

It would be very nice to see that significantly improved in outreach for the 2015. Please go ahead Ron.

RON ANDRUFF:	Thank you very much Chair. Ron Andruff for the record. I'm just wondering, when we look at this, in fact, how we went… If you recall, we had in 2013, we said it was an aspirational goal. We talked about aspirations, and really thinking what could we do to build, to grow to the future. So aspirational we said, we really want to see more gender balance.

And we've really been working towards, and if I recall deliberations this year, just from the deliberation side, we had a very good slate of male/female.   So it would be interesting to see that against this, because indeed we work aspirational towards to that, I think we had some very strong candidates in the end. But not saying more, those of us who were on the 2014 know that very well. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	And there is a lot more graphs, which I've chosen not to share, including an analysis over many years of report. So we've got other years compared to other years, and I think that's something I'll make available as well. You know, I didn't want to bore the public too much, but just the raw data, just in terms of SOIs, that's not good enough.

In terms of the quality, as you said, in terms of the balance of gender when we get further down the track, in the sifting and sorting, it's actually markedly improved. So we did get quality and I did certainly not want to miss that point, so thanks for that Ron. Any questions on that before we move on? Other than the fact that I could not get my Open Office to allow me to do the colors that I wanted to for each of those things, because I figured those colors were not the most ideal. So someone maybe can pick that up and do a better job of it next time.

Okay, next slide please. Okay. The inner circle of the females, coming to the point you were raising Ron. And the outer circle are the males, and here we are looking at the positions by gender. Right? The positions by gender. So, GNSO not bad. Comparatively, ccNSOs is balanced. There is not enough yellow, but both bits of yellow. Okay. [Laughter]

That board, still happening? Right? I'm just hopeful that this is some of the visuals that will help you think about what you might need to be doing in the future, and more importantly, have a look at, I think, how well we did do, even when we look at gender diversity this year.

Next year, if I could put in a plea, I would love to see the larger outer circle, having to be labeled the female applicants, and the much smaller circle in the middle. Oh come on, you need something to aim for guys. Anyway, job well done there, but I did think that was an interesting way of looking at it, but again, that board, that's the disparity. Next please.

Now, remembering that there are only two positions, and they are regional, for the ALAC, all right? What was interesting when I picked these very, very basic bits up, is we still had just a little more interest for

fitting into the European seat than we did for North America. I think, looking at this coming year, where you've got three regions to fulfill, it will be very interesting to try and look at just this very raw data again.

I'm quite comfortable with that split. It would perhaps ideally be 50/50, but if we have greatly disproportionate when it goes to three, it may give you some guidance as to where particular outreach needs to go on. Now what I thought was interesting here, is that we've done, for the last two years, correct me if I'm wrong, very particular outreach in Europe. And I think this larger percentage in prior years, has to do with the success of the outreach program.

And this is where the other charts, which I'm not sharing today, which go back over previous years, that large amount of blue, is I think, a direct outcome from effective outreach in Europe.   So, I'm not suggesting it's, you know, a KPI, but I am suggesting that what we're doing from year to year is having an effect.

Next please. ccNSO by region, which I also thought was interesting. Again, outreach in Europe seems to have been effective. We are getting people out of the European region, which are wanting to take these leadership positions. Go ahead Ron.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you Chair. Ron Andruff. I think one of the reasons there was a… We ran an ad in *The Economist* or something along those lines, and as I recall, a number of candidates spoke to that. So I think that proves to be… Was it not in *The Economist* or something?

JOETTE YOUKHANNA: This is Joette.   A couple of years ago, we did use *The Economist*, but I don't recall that it was as successful as intended, and that's why we haven't done it in the…

RON ANDRUFF: That was my question, because you think maybe they're reading it, and that's awakening people. I wanted to identify whether that was the case or not. Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: There was no ad, and there was no spend that we requested for an ad. Sorry, this is Stephane van Gelder. We could look at that next year. However, just to follow on from what Joe was saying, there was, as you know, a significant activities including going out and seeking the help of a professional recruitment firm, which is based in Europe, so that may have something to do with it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As far as the outreach events in Europe are concerned, many of them are in fact, attended by a global audience. For instance, traditionally, NomCom has been for many years, doing outreach at the IGF consultations in Geneva. That's certainly a global…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the transcript record. I also think that when we do reach out to, for example, at an Internet governance forum, wherever that is located in whatever region, if we track that over time, we'll probably be

able to work out how effective outreach in particular events, because of course, they shift around from region to region.

But whichever way you cut it, there's a problem with Latin America and Caribbean, and Africa in that mix, should get talent into ccNSO. Hey? So next slide.

A bit more color this time. Out of 58 applicants, GNSO managed to have clearly have an attractive enough from people of suitable talent from all regions, but look at the Asia Pacific. We did actually do again, very well to get a good number of people apply, specifically for GNSO positions, out of APAC. And I think that's credit where credit is due.

And again, look at Africa, that's the green bar, right? We were asked to get more out of Asia, and more out of Africa, you did it. Job well done. Next slide.

And the Board positions per region. I was actually surprised by that one. That kind of surprised me. We know we had excellently large and effective numbers from Asia Pacific, that's the one on the right. North America and Europe, not far off. Even LAC there is actually quite a good balance there.

But there again, we need to look at the fact that that's not equitably balanced. There are regions, who even for the Board positions, we're not attracting as much geographic diversity, as well as we're not getting the gender diversity. And without the geographic diversity, of course, that is an issue. And for the public record, we now have appointed, with Asia, what has happened is we now have a fifth member of the ICANN Board from the APAC region.

So from the ICANN Board's point of view, we can't appoint anymore from that region. There is no more room at the inn for anyone for Asia Pacific, until some of the term limited seats come up over the next couple of years, and then it depends what the support organizations put into those seats.

So that the geography of where the support organizations refill those seats is going to come into play. So you need to watch this space, but we've not got a really quite a good talent pool. I would like to suggest that if we've got that much of our little mapping interested in Board positions, we should be able for the other leadership roles.

So what we possibly need to do is a bit of sales pitch on what it has been in the councils where policy is actually coming from, that might be underrated as a way to effect change, and to have engagement. All right? So perhaps a little marketing to try and make it more obvious that the council positions, and indeed the ALAC positions, are a real, bona fide, leadership position with considerable influence and power.

Is there a next slide? I'm not sure that there is, which brings me to where I want to be, questions and answer. There is one that says Q&A? No? Okay. If there was a next slide, it would have said questions and answers, and with the minutes remaining, I'm hoping that with the roving mic, we might even get some audience questions.

Then we'll let us talk at each other as well. Audience, are you in any way interested, any questions? Careful, I might ask you questions. No questions?

[Laughter] No questions?

[Laughter] We're all good? Okay, back to the table. I just want to make sure that the brave audience that weren't lured… Apparently, there is some other thing happening, something to do with, oh I don't know. IANA something transitioning some topic, just a little matter, competing with us. So I don't know why everyone is not here. There is another topic being discussed.

All right. Let's open the table. Ladies and gentlemen, specifically to our reporting in our public meeting. We have five minutes. The floor is yours. Let's take a queue.

BRENDEN KUERBIS: Good morning, Brenden Kuerbis, NCUC rep to NomCom. Thanks for the very helpful report.   It's good to get this feedback, a summary of applicants. I'm wondering if an improvement might be to kind of look at these distributions through the process. So this is the initial applicant pool, right? And then, our process is we actually call out some of the applications as we move closer to selections.

And I think it would really help the community broadly, kind of understand what the qualities are, or might emphasize for the community, what qualities are necessary in order to be selected, really. Because I imagine these distributions change quite a bit, and I'm not commenting on any region or anything like that, I'm just suggesting that it may help us in our thinking about how we recruit applicants, what we say to people who are thinking about applying, what skillsets we're looking for, these types of things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Written it down, I will be sending that as a strong recommendation for the NC 15 to probably consider, and if they would like to pick that up, that would be certainly my pleasure to play with the numbers. Anyone else? Go ahead Stephane.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Just, thank you Cheryl. I understood what you suggested Brenden. Stephane van Gelder speaking. Are you suggesting that we do this for geo-diversity criteria?

Yeah. That's what you're suggesting, right? And that we publish it?

BRENDEN KUERBIS: Yes, I think it would be helpful, potentially. And we would have to think through what kind of impact it might have, and how it's presented, of course. But I do think, at the end of the day, when we do our final report, it might be helpful point of information.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I do think it's a good idea. Just one word of caution is that we don't want to… There are some positions, as you know, where getting applicants of any kind is difficult. So we also want to be careful that we don't send a signal that the gate is closed for you, when it may not be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll have to be smart about it, but I actually think a simple graphic representation, and go oh yeah, is a good way to… Nobody wants to

read a 365 page report with lots of charts and tables, but some of these colored things are good. Go ahead Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Hi. Sarah Deutsch from the business constituency. I really like the idea of a graphic representation, so when people are thinking about which position to apply for, they could see a chart, which would be best for. And they would have little columns with kind of the qualities and categories, and then that might help corral people into good choices to what their skill sets are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Sarah. And my note was really simple from what you've said, it's called do the [McKaley] graphic. We were trying to describe just on the issue on the shop being full and no room at the end sort of imagery, for Asia PAC, and it wasn't getting through. So we've already got a need to do… So we've undertaken to send them a [McKaley] graphic, that even he can understand. And I do love him dearly, so he'll let me get away with that on the public record.

But he needs to see something that says, "Oh, I understand why…" And these seats, in what year coming out, etc. etc. So, from that point of view, I think the more infographic type information we can get out, and have published on the site, the better. Ladies and gentlemen, yes, one minute. Any final words? I don't mean as we're going to, you know, pass on, but any final words for this meeting with the 45 seconds to go?

Go ahead please Louis.

LOUIS HOULE: I've seen that excellent work done, and I have some concerns in out reaching. Out reaching needs, and maybe it would be interesting to add some graphic information on that issue also. And even there, we've been talking about RGF, maybe strategy, local strategy that could be outlined, what's been done in the past years, and what's been successful. And what's been less successful, maybe.

From our experience, would be useful to target better candidates.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you noted. Stephane.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks. Stephane. Just to tease a bit of 2015, that's something that we've already got planned for you for the kick off.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now I'm not going to let 2015 have the last word. I'm going to make 2014 have the last word, and I don't know how you still feel about each other, but I know how I feel about you and you deserve my standing ovation.

[Applause]

And with that ladies and gentlemen, I'm afraid I'm going to have to ask everybody who is not a 2015, what? Oh, all right then.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Well, you can sit down now Cheryl. I think we, it certainly has been a good year and a pleasure to serve as your chair elect. And this very good group of people. And it has been a pleasure to serve under you Cheryl. So if anyone is going to get a round of applause for finishing the meeting, I think it should be you. Thank you.

[Applause]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I like the trains that run on time. We are now having a closed meeting I'm afraid. So 2015 NomCom and 2014 NomCom please stay. If you are not 2015 NomCom and 2014 NomCom, with all my love and respect, get out.

[Laughter]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]