
SINGAPORE – 2014 NomCom Public Meeting
Wednesday, March 26th 2014 – 16:00 to 17:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...This very important piece of paper is a Nominating Committee Member. I'm not planning to take the time in this call today to go through and do introductions, because we have a very short amount of time for our meeting, and we'd like to get a point where perhaps we're all so interactive today. But everybody who does speak – and I do hope you all will, whether or not you've got [a card? 00:00:24] in front of you, or whether you're here to find out a little bit more about what we do.

Whenever you speak, can you please identify yourselves. One of the most common things you'll hear me say is, "My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record." If you're a NomCom Member, the first time you speak I think it would be a good idea – mine currently says "Chair" – but if it says I was from the North American region of ALAC, just identify what you are and where you've come from. Not a spiel, but just to give people a flavor of the diversity of what a NomCom is all about.

With that little bit of a preamble done, we do have a tradition and expectation of Member attendance. One of the things we always start our meetings... We are doing a normal meeting, with some slight modifications to make sure we're updating any visitors that are in the room. This is the same as a normal business meeting, accepting we would want to interact with you as well, because this is a rare opportunity for us all. The first thing we always do is a roll call and at that point I'm going to hand over to Joette.

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.

JOETTE YOUKHANNA: Sarah? Vanda? Ron? John? Satish? Hans? Brenden? Louis? Robert? Yrjö? Cheryl? John? Don? Juhani? Alain? Stéphane?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there anyone that hasn't roll-called off? Fantastic, thank you very much. Is there anybody who, at this stage, wants to add anything to our relatively lean, short meeting Agenda today? We're discussing our new look and feel. The way that we are now more transparent, having a quick look at the website and those sorts of features, talking a little bit about the new SOI form. We'll also go over our activities here at ICANN 49. We'll want to spend a bit of time on proposed bylaw changes, and we're also going to be looking at our timeline.

So that's the Agenda that we'd like to run today. Is there anybody who wants to put in any other business, or reorder any of those points? Not seeing anybody and nobody's waving at me in the room. I'm going to take the time to recognize Hans for this particular meeting, because I have missed him on a number of meetings to-date. Not that he hasn't been there, I just keep forgetting to look and see him at the back of the room. So yesterday I kept introducing people.

It wasn't deliberate to miss you. Now you've been extra noticed here today. [laughs] Today you're not here? There you go. It must be me. Let's get straight into it now. Can we pull up the website? We like to think that we've been responsive to what the community has said to us. While the technology catches up with the topic, we've since last year and to some extent the beginning of this happened in the year before,



but particularly while Yrjö was Chair, we've tried to bring the NomCom out from behind closed doors. This meeting is an example of that.

AT every ICANN meeting since we've made this decision in Toronto, we've had a public meeting. It's not a meeting to talk at you and promote what we're doing. We do that on Tuesday with all the component parts of ICANN. This is a normal business meeting, so there's no mystery about what happens and goes on. We have got a rule however, and that is that personal information and candidate information is sacrosanct and must be treated with the upmost confidentiality.

Any time that there is something that may go on, which may reflect or may use as example identifiable or candidate-like information, we will go behind closed doors. We have had a couple of meetings here at ICANN 49 where we have had closed doors. One of the things we're going to do is report to you what we've been doing in those meetings and what we will be doing in those meetings, so again there's no mystery to what goes on.

The processes are to be public. If you have a question about the process, if you're not sure about a process, if you have a suggestion about a process, this is an interactive listening NomCom, which wants to continue to improve. As Chair Elect, Stéphane will definitely want to take as many good ideas into his year of running a NomCom. We'd like to think that in maybe two years' time people will be so bored with hearing about the NomCom and what we do, that it will in no way be thought of as a black box or a mystery, with the exception of what we do with candidate evaluation and actual identifiable information.



That's our ground rules from now. To that end, if we have a look, we've done a whole website about Stéphane, as you can see. I don't know why YouTube decided between Yrjö and myself and Stéphane that he was the fact, but Stéphane is the face. The face of the future. That might very well be it. In line for a corporate look for microsites in ICANN, we've redone our website.

We have taken advantage of doing a video where, what we think is, if somebody is asking you, "What is this NomCom and what's it all about?" you are safe to suggest they go and visit the site and that they will in fact get some information that's meaningful and not confusing.

On this same web page there are simple links to follow, where an aspiring applicant can push an "apply now" button and it takes them to the brand new web form. Now, the web form we're very proud of, and I want to recognize the work that's been done so far by the NomCom as they've worked in Sub-Teams.

A group of people started off first of all in a bit of an administrivia exercise whereby our own operational procedural manual was overhauled and reviewed. We've got that to where we think it's a valuable document, and we've published it, which is absolutely essential. That in itself is pretty special.

It is an important landmark, I think, to note that even our processes and procedures, and the NDA type documents and behavioral norms we follow are public, because they're part of the process. That's one Sub-Team. You'll hear about another Sub-Team later, which is a Bylaw Review. The Sub-Team that's come up with the new web form has done a huge amount of work, and has, I think – and I believe the rest of the



Committee agrees with me here – has made such an improvement on what was, in some cases, the first experience a potential Board Member or leader would get of ICANN.

The previous form, if you've never had the delight of having applied, couldn't even be saved. It was a web form that did not even allow a save, so there was no choice but for the candidate to do it go-to-woe in one sitting. It was not a very attractive way forward, so it's been completely overhauled and reviewed. You're looking at the very beginning of the page system here, where the identifiables of the potential candidate are captured.

They fill out a group of basic questions, including whether or not they're planning to go for the Board position – and we have two seats for Board to consider at the moment –, whether they're going for a gNSO position – and that's one seat on the gNSO Council –, whether they're planning on looking at ccNSO – again, one seat –, or if they're looking at the ALAC, which is two seats but it's geographically limited. I just wanted to note with extreme pleasure that we have a couple of the people we appointed under the geographic limitations last year.

I have Rafid and... You've both been appointed... Three? Three for three, my heavens! We've done brilliantly well, I should have had you clustered together. We're now appointing for North America and Europe in this coming year. Once this one-pager of identifiables is filled out, staff then prepare a personalized profile page, and the aspirant is sent the link to that, where they then fill out the forms – and they have as much time as they need, up until the close of the day UTC 1st of April – and answer the questions, five or six, on each of the positions.



It can be saved, and until they sign off on it it's not considered completed. So a very different experience to what you three had. I'd actually like at one point, if any of you have the spare time, if you would go through, as a test, and just give us some feedback on how much better this system is. I think we could find that valuable. Enough of that. It's new, it's shiny, we think it works. Let's move on. Are there any questions about why we've done these things at all? Ron?

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you Chair. I'm glad that you noted that there are NomCom Appointees in the room, because often we work just looking at documentation. In the past we didn't even have a photograph of you. That's one of the improvements that we have, so at least we now know who it is. It's exciting to see you in the room. Again, we work in a vacuum. We name people and we [inaudible 00:13:15] work is done when we leave the room.

But when we physically see you sitting here and we know that this is the result of the labor, it's really a pleasure. So thank you for taking the time to come and sit in today. I too would echo what the Chair has asked. If you would like to fill out the form, if you could see Joette, because you *may* want to reapply, but the fact is, whether you are or not, if you want to just test it it would be good for us. We have part one, which is the profile, part two is the data and then part three is a feedback form, and it's about half a dozen questions.

We'd really value that input from the three of you. I just wanted to echo the Chair's invitation for that. The reason I'm asking you to see Joette is



to make sure you get a number that we're assigning for testing so that we're not confused. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rafid, go ahead.

RAF FATANI: Well, me and my colleagues nodded our heads so I think we'll take you up on that. We'd also like to thank the unforeseen faces that nominated us in here. I'll take this opportunity to say thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Of course, many of the faces were different last year, so we'll pass on that, indeed. I assume everyone's happy that we have a new look. We're happy that we have a new look and feel, and if you don't mind we'll move onto our next Agenda Item. Our activities here at ICANN 49. I'm going to ask Yrjö to give us a little introduction on the meetings that we do on Tuesday, on Constituency Day, on what we've done.

I'm going to ask Stéphane to give everyone a bit of a general briefing on the closed meeting and the nature of what we were doing when we had the closed meeting – not the details – on Monday when we were talking to consultants. Then I'm going to give you a little bit of an insight, with Joette's help, of what we will be doing tomorrow in our other closed meeting. Over to you Yrjö.



YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Thank you Chair. On Tuesday, on the Constituency Day, we tried to go to as many constituency meetings as possible, all who want to see us. We go there for 15 minutes and basically explain and introduce ourselves – that is to say the Leadership Team and those Committee Members who want to come with us, and who has time – and tell them about the process, tell them about the timeline, and about the process. There is still time to apply. This is part of our outreach recruitment effort also.

We've been telling everybody to think whether he, she or their friends could fit any of these positions. We've been emphasizing that the 1st of April is the deadline, and even though that's April Fool's Day, this is actually a fact – that is to say, our Chair has promised that this NomCom will go down in history as probably being the first NomCom that's not extended the deadline. So you have to take the 1st of April seriously. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Very seriously indeed. Yrjö's going to take us through the timeline again later. Stéphane, over to you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Thank you Cheryl. Stéphane Van Gelder, NomCom Chair Elect for 2014. Welcome everybody. It's great to see so many people here for the open meeting, which as Cheryl said is part of our intensive effort to make the process of the NomCom more transparent and more open. Thank you for being here. In that regard, let me just explain to you what we've



done during the closed meetings that we had this week, and give you a general overview of what was done.

On Monday we spent some time with the recruitment firm that we're using for this NomCom cycle, OB. We worked with them to gain a better mutual understanding of the work to be done. I'm not going to be too precise on exactly what was done, because as said, we value the secrecy of the data and the candidate information that we use. I hope you'll allow me to gloss over that and just let you know what happened. Today, this morning, the NomCom has also met to continue reviewing its processes.

Yesterday, as was mentioned, we met with all the groups and constituencies within ICANN to spread the message and explain what we were doing, and foster more applications. This morning we went over the SOI and computer or system changes that have been introduced this year. What we've done is basically trained ourselves to use the systems that we're asking applicants to use.

We're extremely careful to ensure that those systems do conform to our desire to make the process of applying easier, more user-friendly, and more efficient for you – as applicants, if there are applicants here – we understand that everybody's time is precious, and so is the NomCom's. This also helps the NomCom process itself gain an efficiency, because when it becomes time to select, the work that's been done will, we hope, make that easier. So we've done that.

Tomorrow, if I can give you a head's up on that, we are looking to continue our training work, and we'll focus more on training ourselves to interview people, because that's also part of our work and we're not all



experts in that field. All these efforts are new. They're part of the NomCom's ongoing drive towards improving itself. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Stéphane. I'd like to pause now and see if there are any comments or questions from the audience or indeed any of the NomCom Members at this point in time? Told you we were boring. Okay. Let me assure you that the ordinary business meeting agenda to date has had things like "report from each of the Sub-Teams," we discuss what they've done, pretty normal business stuff. Then we may also have shared what outreach activities we've done and share any outreach opportunities we might know about.

Beyond that – and of course the outreach now, we've described what we did on Tuesday, but we're coming to the end of that process – there is nothing new. Nothing's been in another agenda that isn't really in this one. Leon please?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Cheryl. Well, first of all, thank you for nominating us, just as Raf said. We're glad to help you. At least I will be testing the new application. I was wondering if there is some kind of guide for filling in the application, like maybe a very simple PDF in which you could tell applicants how to fill in the different spaces in the new form.

Surely, if it's more user-friendly this time I think it would be pretty easy for us to fill in the blanks, but then again, maybe some criteria or recommendations for the new applicants so they won't be terrified in front of the computer when filling in the application might be helpful.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Leon, I hope we're not making a terrifying model, believe me. Ron, you headed up this Sub-Team. Please?

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you Leon. You'll be very pleased to know that we've tried to make this not only friendly but professional. When you start the application you don't go to the form right away. You send a message to us that you'd like to, we invite you with an email coming from our Secretariat, and in there all of the explanation is in that email about everything that needs to be done.

Then you'll be given a number, and with that number you have an access. When you have access, all the information again is laid out very simply and very clearly. It's literally all you need. Even things you should not do, vis-à-vis, don't take out the number and put your name is, because we're trying to keep these things in a confidential way. It's really well-defined, we think it's well-defined, but that's why we'd like to have real users tell us if in fact it is.

Again, it's the first time. This is the 1.0. We expect there will be corrections and things that will improve. That's why we have a feedback section, which is as important as the profile and the other elements, so that over the years this becomes such a refined and well-oiled tool that it's very simple for applicants.

It's also a tool for us that serves the work of the NomCom, which has never been there before. Moreover, the third element is that it's a tool that serves staff, because with hundreds of applications coming in, and



staff having to deal with all of that, it serves them. So we think it covers all the bases, but again, it's 1.0, so I just wanted to put that caveat out there. Thank you for that question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just looking around. I'm not seeing anybody doing the famous signal. I do apologize, I do not know your name. Please identify yourself.

[NALLA ULLRICH]: Hello, my name is [Nalla Ullrich? 00:24:22]. I'm from Serbia. I wanted to save the question for later, but it's related to the subject currently on the table. From what you have said, the form shown is not exactly the application form because it's publicly available and anybody could enter it and [imitation? 00:24:43]. It's a form to get an invitation?

RON ANDRUFF: That's correct. When you start, you put in the information. That then shows up at our Secretariat. Our Secretariat then comes back to you and gives you the keys to the castle.

[NALLA ULLRICH]: Okay. There is maybe one suggestion that you tried to find any other information regarding the application, which is something that he said. But for this first stage, maybe it would be a good idea to put the number of open places in the form, where you can check, "One, two, three, four."



RON ANDRUFF: Well, I think it's on the... In terms of what we're looking for as a NomCom – two Board seats, gNSO Council and so forth – is that what you're suggesting?

[NALLA ULLRICH]: Yes.

RON ANDRUFF: I'm not sure how that looks, but I'm happy to defer to our Secretariat to make sure that's there. Thank you.

[NALLA ULLRICH]: This is the look of somebody who wasn't involved in the process in any way. I just came here. I'm listening, seeing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's really valuable feedback, because we spend so much time saying what those positions are that it's ingrained. So this is one of those not seeing the forest for the trees situations. While you say that we go, "Of course!" We will put those nomenclatures of how many is in each of those categories. Back to you please.

[NALLA ULLRICH]: If that's the only thing, in this form that's the only thing that's problematic. I would have more comment without that explanation that



it's in fact an introductory form that will get you the keys to the kingdom.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're even secret keys to the kingdom. I am allowed to say that, because they're very private keys. Let's now move on. We have another Sub-Team which has been reporting to us at regular interviews, and is now at a pretty important part of its work. I'm going to hand over to Stéphane now. In this matter in particular, if you have opinion or comment we really would value it. Over to you Stéphane.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you Cheryl. Perhaps to highlight that we're now getting back into the standard Agenda. What you're now seeing, for those of you who aren't on the NomCom, is the NomCom at work, rather than updates to the community. The Agenda Item that we're dealing with now pertains to a desire of this year's Committee, under Cheryl's leadership, to review or look at the bylaws that govern the NomCom and more specifically in two areas – one of which is the composition of the Committee, and the other is the term "length" of membership for the voting Members.

There are two types of Members, as you well know, and we're talking about the voting Members only. I want to recognize the Members of the Sub-Committee on bylaw revisions that have worked with me on this. John Berryhill over here. John McElwaine over there, and Bill Manning. The four of us have been working on a document that was sent to the full Committee, via its Chair, Cheryl, a few weeks ago. I forget when. It has a proposal to do the following:



The first proposal is to add on the composition of the Committee one delegate from the Not-For-Profit Operational Concerns, which is a constituency that was recently added to the NCPH – the Non-Contracted Parties House of the gNSO. That constituency does not have representation on the NomCom at the moment.

There is a gNSO review that's due, so the Sub-Committee went back and forth on this, questioning whether a deeper revision of the composition was necessary. We actually took the easy way out and just suggest to the full Committee that for now we just add a seat for the NPOC.

The second revision is slightly more complicated in terms of what we're suggesting. If I can turn to John McElwaine, without any advance warning. You worked a lot on this, so if you're able to give the Committee a bit of a briefing that would be great.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Sure. The revision to the bylaws dealing with term limits was... Currently the bylaws are structured so that it's a one-year term on the NomCom and you could rollover for one additional year, and then you were term-limited out. You had to be off for at least a year. One of the thoughts was that that left a knowledge gap, particularly when you had everybody...

There was the staggering of those terms, so theoretically you could have a new NomCom every one or two years, and that gets to a point where you're losing a lot of that institutional knowledge. So one of the ideas was to stagger the terms and extend them to two years. It's a little complex when you read it because we're having to start that anew, but



once it gets going it's a fairly simple procedure of having a two-year term with maximum of two-year terms.

50% of those seats would be staggered, so that at one time you'd have at least 50% of the people with some experience. That's essentially the bylaw revision proposed.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: John, thanks very much. Cheryl, I'll hand it back to you for discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Stéphane. I'm opening the floor. I see Ron, Hans, Brenden, Robert. Okay.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you Chair. I know that we're now – within the Business Constituency – we're revising our Charter. I know that the Charter that we come up with; that we revise and refine within the BC will then go out to public comment for the broader community's review and confirmation before it's adopted. How does that work within the NomCom? Is it the same thing? Or does it go back to the BCG? I'd like to know how that might play out. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Any bylaw change, first of all, we do run it through ICANN Legal, and any adjustment that may need to be made, in case there are unforeseen consequences to other bylaws are checked for, and then it does go



through a public comment. So bylaw changes do go through a process of public comment.

Whether or not that will be what happens this time will be part two of our situation, because it's not as simple as we thought it was this time around, which is with us putting forward these bylaw change proposals, and it happening very much as if any constituency or component part of ICANN was doing the same thing. John, please go ahead.

JOHN BERRYHILL:

This might be what Stéphane was going to say, but my understanding was that it would only be a recommendation to the Board, and so they could change it, revise it, throw it out, not do it at all. Then if they decided to do something, that's what would be put out for comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

In fact we won't be putting anything out for comment by the look of it. Back to you, Stéphane.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Thank you. We're not putting anything out for comment. What John just said is exactly right – it's a recommendation. This ties into another process though, which is one that we've described this week, which is the Board Working Group on the NomCom. If the NomCom, as a Committee, approves these changes, what it is approving is it's giving the Chair the leeway to present these changes to the Board Committee on NomCom, and that's it.



It's up to the Board then to do with it what it will. This is us being proactive in suggesting possible changes, and explaining why we think they're a good idea. But beyond that, the Board may not elect to put this out for public comment. It's their decision.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I don't believe bylaws can be changed without public comment, but we can have that conversation some other time. Hans?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Thank you. I have a couple of comments to the proposal. First, I fully understand the constituency without the voice, so I support them per se, but the solution to extending the Council whenever we [have/are? 00:34:45] the constituency I find problematic in several ways. We then increase – if I'm able to count correctly – the number of voting Members from 15 to 16. So we need some procedure to figure out if we have a voting time, how will we resolve that?

The other thing is that this also means that the gNSO is very close to getting a majority in the NomCom. Then, if somebody wants to be creative, the Head of ccNSO could then easily organize itself in five constituencies; one for each region, and ask for four more places. Then NomCom would be really huge. I'm not going to suggest that the ASO would do that as well, but... [laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your point is well taken, and you've got five regions too. I think what you've hit on there is exactly why the work of the Board review on all of



this is focusing on how a NomCom needs to be structured, because there is a real potential for a huge snowball. Whilst it might be very nice to have plenty of willing workers at times – like doing the deep-dive etcetera, that we do in our process and that Yrjö will discuss shortly with our timeline review – managing a group of even this size can get a little unwieldy.

So if we were to raise it by one-third it gets me very scared indeed. That's not the point. It needs to be discussed, and might I say your points would undoubtedly come out during a public comment phase. But we were also responding to a specific need, and a result of that analysis brought this forward. Back to you, Stéphane.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Two points. Hans, this is exactly the discussion that we now need to have at NomCom level, so that's perfect. Before we, as a Committee, say to Cheryl, "Okay, send this to the Working Group," just to clarify the earlier point, I was referring to the Board Working Group putting out something for public comment. Cheryl is absolutely right – and my understanding as well – that if there's any ICANN bylaw change, that has to go to public comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Brenden?

BRENDEN KUERBIS: Thank you Cheryl. Thanks to the Sub-Committee for the work on this. I know, having done Charters for the NCSG it's a difficult task. I'm glad to



hear that any proposed changes will go up for comment. One risk that was identified in our February report – it came from Council actually – was that some NomCom Members could receive a tenure of four consecutive years, and therefore potentially achieve undue influence on the NomCom’s selections. I’m curious whether there was anything in your debate, or the proposed language, that addresses that concern?

That’s the question. Then more generally, I’m wondering if we may be using the wrong tool – that is term extensions – to accomplish the goal, which is to create an efficient and effective NomCom. I think there are a lot of potential other means that we could use. The improved data collection efforts that have gone on now with the Wiki. I think there are other areas we could improve on. Documenting operational processes.

To make it really dry and boring as to what NomCom voting Members actually do, and then better internal reporting, so we have a much better idea of where there may be gaps in the applicants, so we can address those things. I’ll leave it there.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Taking those questions in order. Yes, there was discussion on the possibility of capture, which I guess is what you’re talking about. We felt that there are other mechanisms that are in place, including the balance between voting and AC representatives, the balance between SO representatives, which would allow the NomCom to gain the benefit of experience retention whilst lowering the risk of capture.

That is a risk though, and we do recognize that this is a change which might allow NomCom voting Members to stay on longer. We also feel



that as the NomCom builds up its transparency, therefore its accountability to the community, that community which is, let's not forget, the body that elects those people to the NomCom in the first place, would be able to track their behavior on the Committee.

That ties into two other points – the second part of your question. One point is review of the performance of the Committee itself, which is a whole different ballgame, but I'll just put that out there as a placeholder. That would be a way for the community to gauge the performance of the people it elects to this Committee.

Your second question, and the second point there – we are making suggestions only, but we don't really see, right now, any other simple, quick, short-term solution to the problem that we have of trying to be as inclusive of the gNSO communities as we can, whilst maintaining the balance. Perhaps there are suggestions. I don't know if members here have some, but we did struggle with this, to put it simply.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rob and then Sarah.

ROBERT GUERRA: I want to say that some of the points that I was going to mention were mentioned by Hans and Brenden. What's important for this Committee, particularly in how it's seen as a key structure inside ICANN, is that it's not only what it tries to do but also the perception for capture and other things as well, too. So I think that in as much as we can present a variety of different options, and as long as it's important that we can identify



the pluses and minuses of the different options that we're presenting, we don't necessarily have to wait for the community to do that.

So I think we should be robust in that description, because that shows that we're sophisticated enough to do that – one, in regards to the size. Adding one is fine, but we can say if this gets scales then that will present a problem that would require larger community input to try to solve. I think another issue that I don't think has been part of this conversation, but would be part of a conversation in regards to restructure something like that is, what is the maximum size that we wish the NomCom to be, and what is the minimum.

This is a conversation that the SSAC, which has a different process for nominating and selecting members – we've reached a point that we've started to have conversations. There may be a size that is too big, so that may be something. Two other things. Whilst we were talking about extension of the Members' term, another possibility might be the extension of the terms of the Leadership – the Chair and others –, because they would be the institutional history.

Then there's something else that we talked about in Buenos Aires. It's related to the topic of going from one term to another. Right now there's a clean slate every year. It's not necessarily part of the bylaws but more of the processes of the NomCom. If data can be disaggregated for personal identifiable information, then there are trends in information that may be useful from one NomCom to another.

That might be helpful. That's something that we discussed a little bit in BA, but that might be part of the conversation going forward. At least



there could be some knowledge passed from one to the other that removes the PIA.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I was going to say go back to you, and then Sarah, but I also want to say we only have about three more minutes on this topic.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks. I'll try and be very quick. Robert, thanks for bringing that up. I was going to go to that point, also to answer your question. One of the things that I'm looking to do for next year, and that I'm hoping we can work on, and I think we're starting to work on, this year is passing on the history. The NomCom isn't designed to do that right now. A simple summary of that is that it's not built into the way we work right now. I think we can change that and I think we should change that.

The only body that's designed to do that right now within the NomCom is the Leadership Team, because there is this rotation here. The rest depends on the community to re-elect the same people, and that frankly, I find, is a major flaw in the system right now. I know Cheryl and Yrjö agree with me, and I think part of this work is also connected to the work we need to do ongoing, and to making sure that, for example making sure what we've done with recruitment and the solutions we've found, why wouldn't the next year's Committee benefit from that?



SARAH DEUTSCH: If you could explain again how these staggered terms are determined, and when do those start? Do those start right away? Do they start after the first extension? Also, was there any consideration that the balance between extended knowledge and term limits is a good one, but was there a discussion of term limits for everyone on the NomCom? Voting Members have some influence, but even non-voting Members have influence, since there's a lot of advocacy and opinions that get expressed, etcetera.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. I'll answer the second question first and pass it onto John for the first. We took a deliberate determination only to look at the voting membership. We did not attack the non-voting membership, and that was for efficiency's sake as much as anything else. That discussion is open and up to the NomCom to take it up. I'll pass it over to John for the first point.

JOHN BERRYHILL: These are all great points. I wish we'd had a little bit more of this discussion when we were working on this in the past. The way you typically would do this in any type of corporation when you were trying to stagger a Board that wasn't staggered, is you actually have the current Board select 50% of the people to stay on for a shorter term. Now, this would not apply to anybody here, because by the time it got enacted everybody would have rotated off.

So you'd end up having 50% of the people selected for a one-year term, and 50% selected for a two-year term, to start off the very first class of staggered terms.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ron?

RON ANDRUFF: I think that the staggering of the terms is really very good and really helpful because we do need to maintain some institutional memory. For myself, when I came onto the NomCom last year I was completely ignorant of the practices and all the various things that happened with regard to deep dives and other things. Now having had the experience I find myself telling the new members this year, as we did this morning, we talked about how these elements work.

So continuing to maintain that type of process is a very good one. Where I am uncomfortable, as many of us know there's at least one Member that I'm aware of that's been around for about nine years or so, who I think is non-voting, and I think that cannot continue. That really has to come to an end. We need to make sure that we get ourselves where everyone rotates in and out, because that's where it becomes problematic. There should be no squatters, if I can use that term.

There should be no one sitting on here longer than anyone else. A couple of years is a very good service and after that they should move on. I really think that might be something we'd like the Committee to go back and look at again. Thank you.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Ron. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: One of the questions that I had, I thought that a number of the layout of how the rotation was put in place, was done under the assumption that there were multiple representatives from the respective organizations. Well, some of the organizations, mine being one, only have a single representative. I think that needs to be thought about. One of the other comments I'd like to make is that in some of the organizations it's a challenge to get people to agree to serve on the NomCom.

Therefore, that sometimes results in one person serving longer than you might otherwise, because no one else is willing to. So that's a problem. I was also asked by my folks that I represent that if I thought it would be difficult to find someone who would be agreeable to serve, to commit to two years upfront.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're very real issues and they'll need to be identified and put forward. I think the skill here will be to pass onto this new Review Committee of the Board a well thought out discussion paper, with rationale, with risk, with a very good assessment – not necessarily with all the answers, but certainly for food for thought. I have Ron and then Stéphane.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you Chair. With respect, Russ, I appreciate everything you've just said, but with respect to the comment about sometimes it's difficult to



find another so one individual would stay on. That notwithstanding then they should not stay on. We have a place, as I understand it, available here for a GAC representative, and no one fills that Chair.

That means that was a conscious choice, and I would say that if any one of the constituencies cannot find a candidate to fill a spot, then an individual can be here for two years, sits out for a year, and if that individual then comes back again for another two-year term, that's fine. But they have to sit out and that seat sits empty because the constituency can't fill the seat. You cannot continue to send someone back here year in, year out, year in, year out. It's not a healthy thing. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Uncannily enough I was going to suggest exactly the same thing as a solution – that voting by absence may be a solution, but it may sound a bit aggressive, so we should be careful here. Another thing I was going to say is that if we are going down this path we need to give a clear rationale as to why people shouldn't be on for nine years. We need to go into the detail of it. It may be obvious to you, Ron, but we need to be careful, for the wider community, if we're suggesting that people may not be on, why is it bad?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. My list is growing. I have Robert, Hans, Veronica and I have closed the line.



ROBERT GUERRA:

I think definitely an issue like this one is a place for a community input. People have a variety of different things. I think there are some constituencies or groups that are quite small, and finding someone at all to fill it is difficult – number one. Number two, if you're going to be starting to put in a limit, then there are constituencies where people are part of multiple constituencies at the same time, and so you may have an individual that for Group A is on the NomCom and then in year two hops to Group B, and stuff like that. You may want to think about that.

Another option – and this is just a brainstorming – is are there other ways to maybe throttle that person? By throttling I mean slowing down. One thing, as you were saying, is making sure the person can't run. The other thing might be allowing the person to vote or not. So there's a variety of different options and they should be explored. Also, if you go back to the earlier conversation, if someone's on for a long time they may also have a sense of history as well.

Until we have the data systems in place there is a certain value. I'm only hearing the negative. There is a value. In some of our conversations, a particular person who has that institutional history has come up and said, "Hey, but six or seven years ago this is the issue that happened and then [inaudible 00:53:35]. So let's try to also put positives in that regard as well.

HANS PETTER HOLEN:

I was just going to comment on the aggressive argument that you [inaudible 00:53:52]. I don't see it as aggressive at all that we impose the same rules for everybody. If we think there is a time limit for voting Members because we want to refresh the NomCom, then that argument



could be used for everybody. As a refinement of that, it could be tied to persons and not persons from separate organizations, so that I can't join the IETF and come back there next year, and so on.

VERONICA CRETU:

Thank you. I think it's also relevant in the context of these discussions. It's also relevant to think within the NomCom about some performance indicators, and to think about some mechanisms that would simply self-evaluation of our own performance, and coming up with those tools that would allow for external evaluation of our performance. Because when you are talking to the communities and they delegate the same person back, but there is certain evidence that things have not worked properly, well, then you really use those evaluation performance results and reports. So I think it's really valuable to think about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I think we all would agree with that, and of course as you may or may not know, the Committee does know, the Board-appointed Leadership Team of Chair and Chair-Elect are now subject to an external consultant's 360-review process. This year we are going to run one internally first as well, and there's nothing stopping a NomCom doing that internal one, at the very least, for us all. We could do a wider peer review. We can discuss that at our next meeting.

It will be at our next meeting shortly, so I'm going to close the queue now because I do want Yrjö to give us a moment on timeline before we vacate this room promptly.



YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Thank you. Our deadline is 1st of April. There is a grace period of a couple of days – 72 hours – to make these applications complete if they've already been started, but then that's it. The Committee starts at the beginning of April to read and assess the Board candidates first, because the aim is to select about 15 Board candidates for further scrutiny and telephone interviews by [ochers and berchen? 00:56:30], which is the head-hunting firm, usually called OB.

We'll try to get these 15 to them before the Easter holidays. When they work on that batch, we concentrate on assessing the candidates for SO Councils and for the ALAC. We should get the assessment – that is to say the scorecards – of those 15 Board candidates back from OB by, I hope, May 12th, the middle of May, at the latest, and that's when we start shortlisting Board candidates with the aim of having less than ten, hopefully – no, nine, eight, whatever – for interviews in London.

We want to come to this decision of who those shortlisted candidates are fairly early, because travel arrangements and visas take time for the UK, especially for candidates who may come from other regions and candidates. Also, we need time for something called deep-diving, which means that we divide the Committee into pairs, and every pair has to investigate one of the candidates.

By “investigate” that means, for instance, calling their referees, people who've given references, recommendations and so on and so forth, and of course Googling them and finding out all the information on them that's on the net, following links which are in the application, and so on and so forth. Finally we come to London. We interview the shortlisted Board candidates and then finally at the end of the meeting, after the



actual meeting has ended – that is to say Friday and Saturday – we go to a secluded place for a selection meeting and the black box, and finally white smoke comes out and we have the “Habemus Papam!” Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Yrjö. Can I thank each one of the NomCom Members who’ve been through this meeting today? Particularly because what we’ve had is really useful input into the continuing bylaw Sub-Team’s work. There are some other bylaws that we will need to work on at our next gathering as well. There are some existing bylaws, limitations, to who can serve on the Board that we also need to look at.

Thank you audience. Thank you anybody who’s online. May I ask you to take your rubbish with you at least to the front table, so we don’t inconvenience the next people who are using this room. Thank you one and all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

