

# Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding

Draft Final Report of the NomCom2 Review			
<b>Publication Date:</b>	15 May 2018		
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Angie Graves		
<b>Public Comment Proceeding</b>		<b>Important Information Links</b>	
Open Date:	27 March 2018		
Close Date:	7 May 2018		
Staff Report Due Date:	21 May 2018		
		Announcement	
		Public Comment Proceeding	
		View Comments Submitted	
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Lars Hoffmann	<b>Email:</b>	lars.hoffmann@icann.org
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps			
<b>General Overview</b>			
<p>On 27 March 2018, the Independent Review of the ICANN Nominating Committee: Draft Final Report, authored by Analysis Group, the contracted independent examiner, was posted for public comment following its review of the Nominating Committee (NomCom).</p>			
<p>This Summary and Analysis does not present the complete process, nor does it present all comments; it instead identifies sentiments broadly expressed by the community in response to the report by Analysis Group.</p>			
<p>10 comments were submitted to <a href="#">the public comment forum</a>-one from an individual and nine on behalf of organizations. Comments and feedback were also provided orally in <a href="#">the public session at ICANN61</a>, and in the <a href="#">webinar on 10 April 2018</a>.</p>			
<p>Oral comments are not represented in this report.</p>			
<b>Next Steps</b>			
<p>All comments and feedback will be considered by Analysis Group in preparing their Final Report, which is expected to be issued in early June 2018. The ICANN Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) will consider the Final Report along with the Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIL), which will reflect the view of the NomCom Review Working Party on the recommendations contained in Analysis Group's Final Report. The OEC, having consulted all relevant documentation, will then issue its recommendation for action to the ICANN Board. Following Board action on the Final Report and the FAIL, planning for implementation will begin.</p>			
Section II: Contributors			

At the time this report was prepared, a total of ten (10) community submissions had been posted to the forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

**Organizations and Groups:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Initials</b>
Security and Stability Advisory Committee	<a href="#">Andrew McConachie</a>	SSAC
Internet Service Providers & Connectivity Providers	<a href="#">Chantelle Doerksen</a>	ISPCP
Registries Stakeholder Group	<a href="#">Paul Diaz</a>	RySG
At-Large Advisory Committee	<a href="#">ICANN org At-Large Staff</a>	ALAC
Registrar Stakeholder Group	<a href="#">Zoe Bonython</a>	RrSG
NonCommercial Stakeholder Group	<a href="#">Rafik Dammak</a>	NCSG
Business Constituency	<a href="#">Steve DelBianco</a>	BC
Intellectual Property Constituency	<a href="#">Brian Scarpelli</a>	IPC
Root Server System Advisory Committee	<a href="#">Carlos Reyes</a>	RSSAC

**Individuals:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation (if provided)</b>	<b>Initials</b>
<a href="#">Nigel Roberts</a>		NR

**Section III: Summary of Comments**

*General Disclaimer:* This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

The public comment forum received ten (10) submissions from the community on the Draft Final Report authored by Analysis Group, independent examiner of the Nominating Committee (NomCom) review. The comments generally fall into the categories listed below, each of which is detailed in Section IV.

Public comment submissions to the report containing twenty-six (26) recommendations proposed by Analysis Group broadly fall into four categories:

- Overall comment/overview statement
- Statement of agreement/support, or disagreement/opposition to a recommendation
- Modification suggestions for report recommendations
- New ideas for improvement of NomCom

Below you will find a detailed analysis of the comments, in addition to the attached table which contains a more extensive representation of all comments received.

Neither this report nor the table is a substitute for reading each complete comment in full, in its original context. These can be found here:

<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/nomcom2-review-2018-03-27-en>

## Section IV: Analysis of Comments

*General Disclaimer:* This section intends to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments submitted along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

### General Overview

Analysis Group's Draft Final Report presented its findings and resulting recommendations for improvement in three categories:

- Composition and Responsibility of the NomCom and its Members
- Processes for Candidate Recruitment and Evaluation
- Additional Recommendations

### Recommendations 1 – 12: Composition and Responsibility of the NomCom and its Members

Either support or conditional support was garnered from commenters of Recommendations 1 through 8, and Recommendation 11. Recommendations 2 and 3 were strongly supported by the RrSG. Commenters offering support and conditional support for these recommendations also offered suggestions for implementation, explanations for their concerns and reservations and conditions for support.

Recommendation 9 prompted comments mainly about conducting additional analysis prior to making judgement, and also one comment about an existing situation with respect to the GAC seat on the NomCom. The BC does not support Recommendation 9.

Recommendation 10 was widely supported, with the NCSG calling for it to be implemented as soon as possible.

Recommendation 12 was supported by the majority of commenters, with the NCSG's opposition based on its assertion that the report recommendation is not the best approach.

### Recommendations 13 – 23: Processes for Candidate Recruitment and Evaluation

Commenters were in support of the majority of Analysis Group's recommendations in the Recruitment and Evaluation category. Specifically, Recommendations 14 – 16, 18, 19, and 21 saw support from commenters, with Recommendations 22 and 23 additionally earning strong support from the RrSG.

Recommendation 13 was supported by all but the NCSG, which stated that the recommendation does not go far enough.

Recommendation 17 received three comments—one in support (RySG), one opposed (ALAC), and one strongly opposed (NCSG). Opposition was based on the need for greater

recognition of diversity. This was the only recommendation in the report receiving strong opposition from commenters.

Support (RySG, NCSG) and strong support (RrSG) for Recommendation 20 was countered by opposition (ALAC) on the grounds that NomCom should perform the preliminary screen of Board candidates.

### **Recommendations 24 – 26: Additional Recommendations**

Support for Recommendation 24 was registered by the RrSG and NCSG, with the RySG agreeing in principal but having concerns about the specifics, and ALAC agreeing on the condition of individual assessments for individual appointees.

Disagreement by the ALAC to Recommendation 25 was met with support (RrSG, NCSG) and conditional/partial support by the RySG and BC—with the RySG having concerns about the resources required to implement, and the BC stating that the program should be a cross - community effort.

### **Analysis of Comments by Recommendation**

*Recommendation 1: Formalize a job description for NomCom members that emphasizes diversity and independence and provide that description to the SO/ACs.*

A total of five commenters registered an opinion, all of which communicated support, except for the NCSG, which expressed, “...this recommendation suffers from vague terms and a lack of clarity...” and that “...there is a need to be clear which purpose the language actually serves...”

*Recommendation 2: Implement and formalize training to further NomCom members’ understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Board directors and the practices of high-performing Boards at other nonprofit organizations.*

Five commenters responded to Recommendation 2 – three with conditional support, and one with strong support—RrSG.

Those offering conditional support suggest (1) introduce systematically, accommodate volunteer time limitations (ISPCP), (2) conditional agreement provided members are not subject to a preset agenda (ALAC), (3) make some considerations for training (ALAC), and (4) members must remain independent (NCSG).

*Recommendation 3: Implement and formalize training for NomCom leadership to further their understanding of their roles, authority, and responsibilities, and confirm or appoint next Chair earlier in the cycle.*

There were four commenters to Recommendation 3—one expressing strong support (RrSG), two in agreement (RySG, ALAC), and one suggesting that the training be introduced systematically, and that it accommodate volunteer time limitations (ISPCP).

*Recommendation 4: Formalize training for NomCom members in the candidate evaluation process.*

Five responses for Recommendation 4 were in support or strong support, except for two, one of which noted a need to introduce the training systematically, and accommodate volunteer time limitations (ISPCP), and ALAC, which provided considerations for implementers of this recommendation.

*Recommendation 5: A professional recruiting consultant should continue to be involved in the role of identifying potential Board candidates. The role of the recruiting consultant should be clarified and published.*

Of the five commenters to Recommendation 5, three support, and two conditionally support, the recommendation. Conditions named were (1) confirmation of a free, fair process (ALAC), (2) limiting any single consultant's term to +/- two years (ALAC), (3) that the firm should submit all candidates to NomCom (BC), and (4) that NomCom should be clear about consultant processes (BC). One of the three supporters made note of the need for results to be reported as an essential part of the process (NCSG).

*Recommendation 6: A professional evaluation consultant should continue to be involved in the evaluation process for Board candidates. The role of the evaluation consultant should be clarified and published.*

Recommendation 6's five respondents were all either in support or conditional support of the recommendation. Of the three conditional supporters, two offered some considerations and conditions for the consultant (RySG, ALAC), and one agreed, but stated that the firm should submit *all* candidates to NomCom, and that NomCom should be clear about the consultant's processes (BC).

*Recommendation 7: NomCom members, except for leadership positions, should serve two-year terms, but be limited to a maximum of two terms.*

Five responses to Recommendation 7 were received, with RySG and RrSG fully supporting the recommendation. The ISPCP's conditional support was based on disagreement over the lifetime term limitation, and it suggested designating a time period during which a member

who served cannot serve again. The ISPCP also suggested exploring other options to find better solutions.

The one neutral commenter did not object to the recommendation, but stated that risks pertaining to influence and collusion be taken into consideration when implementing this recommendation (NCSG).

*Recommendation 8: Maintain the current size of NomCom.*

Three comments were received for Recommendation 8, none of which expresses disagreement. But concerns were expressed about the report's analysis (RySG), and a focus on size over representation (NCSG).

"While the RySG supports maintaining the current size of NomCom based on our own understanding, the report provides no information to allow any reader to be fully informed of the risks or benefits of supporting or opposing the recommendation. We highlight this is one of the areas that is substantively weak on analysis."

"We...suggest refocusing the discussion about the size with proper consideration instead paid to representation. Otherwise, we regard such discussions as meritless." (NCSG)

*Recommendation 9: All NomCom members should be fully participating and voting members, except for NomCom leadership.*

Eight comments were received in response to Recommendation 9, with the ALAC, RrSG, and NCSG in full support. Four respondents were neutral, and one, the BC, expressed opposition. "The BC does not support this position. We recommend that the current practice be maintained such that the SSAC, RSSAC and GAC and NomCom leadership remain non-voting members of NomCom. ..."

Neutral respondents expressed concern about the existing voting structure with respect to the GAC, and that it is problematic (NR), and concern about voting rules with respect to the GAC (RySG). Others suggest that additional analysis of the recommendation is needed (SSAC), that it is still considering the recommendation (RSSAC).

*Recommendation 10: Representation on the NomCom should be reviewed every five years, and, if necessary, re-balanced.*

Three of the five commenters (ISPCP, ALAC, RrSG) to Recommendation 10 support it. Of the remaining commenters, the RySG stated a need for more details, and the NCSG explained its opposition.

The RySG stated a need for more information and substantiation for the recommendation:

"The RySG supports establishing a cross-community working group to investigate how well the NomCom represents the community. Given the staggering number of projects ICANN has underway, and the likelihood that any recommendation to re-balance the NomCom is likely to be a significant effort, we do not support establishing a five-year cadence without evidence as to why that number was selected."

In opposition to the recommendation, the NCSG expressed the need to rebalance immediately, and that the solution presented in the report is unsatisfactory. "The solution for a lack of balance in representation on the NomCom is unsatisfactory..."

"We need this imbalance to be remedied immediately. We therefore ask that the revival of the academic seat on the NomCom be reconsidered," continuing with, "... Such concerns as balanced and proper representation must be addressed as soon as possible, therefore, this recommendation must be reconsidered and urgent mechanisms must be suggested to remedy the imbalance."

*Recommendation 11: The senior staff member supporting NomCom should be accountable to and report to the office of the CEO.*

Recommendation 11's five commenters (ISPCP, RySG, ALAC, RrSG, NCSG) were in support of the recommendation, with ALAC giving only its cautious agreement:

"Given that the NomCom Chair and Chair-elect report to the BGC, their support Staff reporting to the CEO has the potential to create crossed wires, besides constraining the NomCom leadership. If such issues can be avoided and if the proposed arrangement has the potential to enhance the flexibility of the NomCom, only then it is worth implementing."

*Recommendation 12: NomCom Leadership should have input on the NomCom budget and staffing resources.*

Recommendation 12 had four respondents, three of which offered support for the recommendation. In disagreement was the NCSG:

"While this recommendation might make sense, giving the NomCom the latitude to spend its budget in whatever way it deems appropriate is not the best approach in our opinion."

*Recommendation 13: Publish a "Process Diagram" and codify key elements of the NomCom process. Each year, the NomCom should be required to highlight and explain changes made to its processes to the ICANN community in an open session.*

Of the five responses to Recommendation 13, only ALAC expressed full agreement with the recommendation. The ISPCP stated that the recommendation might be good, but that other options should be explored.

The SSAC and ISPCP's conditional support, and NCSG's opposition, were all based on some dissatisfaction with the recommendation, stating that the recommendation needs to be stronger (SSAC), that it needs to include accountability (SSAC), and that it doesn't go far enough (NCSG). From the SSAC: "...any process without some sort of accountability measure does not fit into ICANN's values."

From the NCSG: "The NCSG is of the opinion that this recommendation does not fully address the issue, as we have stated in the beginning of this comment. it is not just a matter of visualizing the process as it must be more about making its [sic] more transparent and adding safeguards."

*Recommendation 14: Formalize communication between the NomCom and the Board, SO/ACs, and the PTI Board in order to understand needed competencies and experience.*

All five commenters responding to Recommendation 14 (ISPCP, RySG, ALAC, RrSG, NCSG) were in support of the recommendation, with the NCSG adding a stipulation: "The NCSG agrees with this recommendation, while not giving more weight for any group inputs than others."

*Recommendation 15: The NomCom should continue the practice of publishing detailed job descriptions for the Board, SO/AC, and PTI Board positions. The job descriptions, in combination with specific needed competencies identified each year by the NomCom, should form the basis for recruiting and evaluation efforts.*

All five commenters to Recommendation 15 (ISPCP, RySG, ALAC, RrSG, RrSG, NCSG) were in support of the recommendation, with RrSG offering a wording change suggestion: "This recommendation states that the NomCom 'should continue the practise of publishing job descriptions...', however use of the word "continues" here may be misleading, since this practise was only just implemented by the 2018 NomCom. A reference to the process being newly implemented would be more appropriate."

*Recommendation 16: Implement and codify a system for providing feedback to the NomCom regarding the contributions and participation of members up for re-appointment by the NomCom.*

The RySG, ALAC, RrSG, and NCSG were all in support of the recommendation, with some suggestions for adjustments from the RySG:

"The RySG supports establishing a transparent and repeatable system for providing feedback to the NomCom regarding members up for re-appointment. We look forward to participating in implementation, though some members have reservations about making information like Board 360 scorecards available as it could compromise confidentiality. We also support gathering and recording public participation metrics, for instance via the scorecard recommended by the report, that can help support a decision for re-appointment or not."



*Recommendation 17: Maintain current diversity requirements for NomCom appointees.*

Comments registered addressing Recommendation 17 came from the RySG, ALAC, and NCSG, with the RySG in support of the recommendation, and ALAC and NCSG opposed and strongly opposed, respectively. ALAC's position is that "we cannot have enough diversity." NCSG maintains that the recommendation does not recognize lack of diversity in the NomCom, or other types of diversity.

From ALAC:

"Do Not Agree: Diversity is usually something that we can never have enough of, particularly given the Multistakeholder composition of ICANN. While there may be challenges in increasing NomCom diversity, we have not yet reached a point where the diversity is sufficient (noting that even the Gender diversity requirements are not met during all years)."

From NCSG:

"... it does not recognize that the NomCom is not diverse enough. Diversity of NomCom appointees must go beyond regional diversity and include gender, skills, and perspectives.

"...the [survey] question posed had implied that diversity in candidates contradicts with appointment of highly qualified candidates. We would like this mistake to be corrected and for the diversity of the NomCom appointees to go beyond regional diversity..."

"...reviewers believe that there should be more independent, unaffiliated Directors (Recommendation 26), but they don't see a necessity to have more diversity among NomCom appointees..."

*Recommendation 18: Publish a candidate communication schedule and codify a communication process with candidates.*

The RySG, ALAC, and NCSG expressed agreement with this recommendation, with no additional substantive comment.

*Recommendation 19: ICANN staff and the recruitment consultant, along with NomCom members, should leverage the detailed job description and desired competencies and experience to develop a marketing plan to better target prospective candidates.*

The RySG, ALAC, and NCSG expressed agreement with this recommendation, with no additional substantive comment.

*Recommendation 20: The evaluation consultant should do a preliminary screen of all Board candidates and provide blinded assessments to the NomCom to assist the NomCom with reducing the pool of candidates to the deep-dive shortlist.*

Of the four commenters to Recommendation 20 (RySG, ALAC, RrSG, NCSG), the RySG and NCSG expressed support for it, with the RrSG expressing strong support for the recommendation.

In disagreement with the recommendation, ALAC commented:

“Do Not Agree: The preliminary screening should be done by the NomCom itself (as it was done this year). Besides being fair, this would also be cost-effective. Screening by an external party has [risk] as its effectiveness is not easy to judge.”

*Recommendation 21: The NomCom should use a standardized matrix to evaluate and prioritize candidates, based on desired competencies and experience.*

The five respondents to Recommendation 21 (ISPCP, RySG, ALAC, RrSG, NCSG), were generally in agreement with the recommendation, with the RrSG in strong agreement.

Expressing neither agreement nor disagreement, the ISPCP provided a consideration:

“The ISPCP wants to point out that ICANN is a very unique organization in its mission and functioning. A standardized evaluation approach doesn't mean this recruiting evaluation approach shouldn't be adapted to ICANN specificities.”

Cautious about the actual implementation of the recommendation, ALAC offered this comment:

“It may not be practically feasible to create such a matrix, but if this can be done to the satisfaction of NomCom members, it could be tried out.”

*Recommendation 22: The NomCom should provide consistent interview questions and an interviewer evaluation form for the candidates interviewed during the deep-dive phase and the final face-to-face interviews.*

Commenters to Recommendation 22 (RySG, ALAC, RrSG, NCSG) all expressed support for this recommendation, with ALAC's agreement conditioned on the presumption of feasibility of its implementation.

*Recommendation 23: The NomCom should publish additional data on the candidate pool and the recruiting source of candidates.*

Commenters to Recommendation 23 (RySG, ALAC, RrSG, NCSG) all expressed support for this recommendation, with the RrSG expressing strong support, and ALAC's agreement “subject to GDPR Compliance at all stages of handling personal data.”

*Recommendation 24: Inform assessments of the NomCom by assessing the performance of the Board.*

Commenters to Recommendation 24 (RySG, ALAC, RrSG, NCSG) all expressed support for this recommendation, with the RySG in agreement principally, but having a concern about the specifics of the implementation, and ALAC providing a stipulation for appointee assessments.

From RySG:

“While we are supportive of an ICANN Board that is critical of its own effectiveness and performance, and agree that sharing information about what competencies currently exist and what potentially need to be filled with the NomCom could be helpful in the search for candidates, some RySG members are concerned that sharing the results of a Board self-assessment outside the Board with the NomCom may be ineffective and risks breaches in confidentiality.”

From ALAC:

“Agree, assuming that the performance of the individual NomCom appointees can be assessed individually.”

The RrSG shared some additional suggestions:

"The Board's effectiveness should be assessed every year to not only improve NomCom's processes, but to also analyse what competencies currently exist and what potentially need to be filled, so that these can be kept in mind when looking for candidates."

*Recommendation 25: ICANN should investigate advancing its nominations process into a Leadership Development function.*

Weak support and some opposition were expressed in response to Recommendation 25. On one end of the spectrum, the RrSG and NCSG solidly support the recommendation. Solid opposition on the other end of the spectrum originated from ALAC, stating “Do Not Agree: This is outside the remit of the NomCom.”

Reserved support for the recommendation, from the RySG and the BC, hinged on conditions:

From the RySG:

"The RySG theoretically supports further Leadership Development, but is also concerned that this would negatively impact ICANN's budget and believe this work should be deprioritized in light of other, more pressing options listed above that are likely to result in a greater positive impact."

From the BC:

"The BC supports this initiative to evolve the current Fellowship program to develop emerging leaders. The current ICANN board has some directors who are products of the fellowship program."

and

“A leadership development program is an important element of filling NomCom's objective to appoint high-caliber people. However, such a program should be designed through a cross-community working group and be subject to public comment."

*Recommendation 26: Provide clarity on desire for independent directors and designate three specific seats for “Independent Directors.”*

Not much support was garnered from commenters for Recommendation 26. Of the six respondents, two expressed opposition (ALAC, BC), three were neutral—all requesting clarification or more information (RySG, RrSG, NCSG), and one communicated conditional support (ISPCP), with the comment that, “The ISPCP supports this proposal but is not convinced that “hardcoding” the designation of three specific seats for ‘Independent Directors’ as proposed in recommendation 26 would help or even improve the overall quality of the Board.”

Comments in opposition to the recommendation expressed (1) observation that the current structure works well already (ALAC), and (2) no support for candidates with little prior ICANN experience (BC).

## **Other Comments**

Comments were also received during the public comment period that did not pertain to a specific recommendation. Each comment fell roughly into one of the following categories:

- reiteration of an earlier recommendation
- criticism of report
- new idea/suggestion
- request for more information
- reminders of ICANN principals, ICANN environment
- concerns about NomCom accountability, transparency
- notification of an issue not satisfactorily addressed in the review

There was one suggestion made by nearly every commenter: establishing a NomCom standing committee—for reasons including continuity across years, goal attainment, adding a strategic component to the NomCom, the potential to work with annual budgets, and others.

## **Overall Analysis Group Report**

Seven respondents made general comments about the Analysis Group Draft Final Report, all of which were in overall support of it (NR, SSAC, ISPCP, RySG, RrSG, BC, ISP). Commenters noted their general agreement with the IE’s findings and recommendations.

For comment details, including representation for all comments submitted, arranged by Recommendation, please refer to the table below.

[insert Excel spreadsheet here]

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
----------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	------------------

Key					
Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Partly/ Conditionally Support	Support	Strongly Support

<b>Recommendation 1: Formalize a job description for NomCom members that emphasizes diversity and independence and provide that description to the SO/ACs.</b>			
	ISPCP	support	
	RySG	The RySG supports job descriptions for NomCom members. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree. ALAC has already internally started a process of drawing up job descriptions. Diversity (particularly of Gender) should be a consideration.	
	RrSG	The RrSG is in full support of further efforts being made to increase diversity within NomCom membership...	
	NCSG	...this recommendation suffers from vague terms and a lack of clarity...there is a need to be clear which purpose the language actually serves...	
<b>Recommendation 2: Implement and formalize training to further NomCom members' understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Board directors and the practices of high-</b>			
introduce systematically, accommodate volunteer time limitations	ISPCP	These initiatives were already put in place by the most recent committee. The ISPCP supports introducing it in a systematic way, while keeping in mind that NomCom members are volunteers fulfilling their role in addition to their day to day work.	
	RySG	The RySG supports training for NomCom members and leadership. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
conditional agreement provided members not subject to a preset agenda	ALAC	Agree, as long as the training does not attempt to coerce members to a preset agenda. NomCom members must keep the overall interests of ICANN as well as the Global Public Interest in mind as general guiding principles.	
some considerations for training	ALAC	As a general point, members of NomCom should be rather guided to understand the broad ecosystem of ICANN, the challenges it faces and the leadership that it requires, rather than provide them only with specific skills. In particular, the importance of non-verbal cues such as body language, which may require specialized training.	
strongly supports	RrSG	The RrSG strongly supports the NomCom receiving appropriate training to better their understanding of general Board operations and the competencies required to do them, as well as the process of recruitment. ...	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
members must remain independent	NCSG	The NCSG supports this idea in principle, however regardless of the training received, NomCom members must remain independent and exercise their own judgment in making selections.	
<b>Recommendation 3: Implement and formalize training for NomCom leadership to further their understanding of their roles, authority, and responsibilities, and confirm or appoint</b>			
introduce systematically, accommodate volunteer time limitations	ISPCP	These initiatives were already put in place by the most recent committee. The ISPCP supports introducing it in a systematic way, while keeping in mind that NomCom members are volunteers fulfilling their role in addition to their day to day work.	
supports	RySG	The RySG supports training for NomCom members and leadership. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
agree	ALAC	Agree on training. The current arrangement of Chair-elect seems to work fine, and it may be disruptive to appoint a Chair while another Chair is serving the role.	
strongly supports	RrSG	The RrSG strongly supports the NomCom receiving appropriate training to better their understanding of general Board operations and the competencies required to do them, as well as the process of recruitment. ...	
<b>Recommendation 4: Formalize training for NomCom members in the candidate evaluation process.</b>			
introduce systematically, accommodate volunteer time limitations	ISPCP	These initiatives were already put in place by the most recent committee. The ISPCP supports introducing it in a systematic way, while keeping in mind that NomCom members are volunteers fulfilling their role in addition to their day to day work.	
	RySG	The RySG supports training for NomCom members and leadership. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree.	
some considerations for training	ALAC	As a general point, members of NomCom should be rather guided to understand the broad ecosystem of ICANN, the challenges it faces and the leadership that it requires, rather than provide them only with specific skills. In particular, the importance of non-verbal cues such as body language, which may require specialized training.	
strongly supports	RrSG	The RrSG strongly supports the NomCom receiving appropriate training to better their understanding of general Board operations and the competencies required to do them, as well as the process of recruitment. ...	
support	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation. We believe that training in interviewing and evaluating candidates is a viable proposal, and also an area where the NomCom could benefit from a professional trainer.	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
<b>Recommendation 5: A professional recruiting consultant should continue to be involved in the role of identifying potential Board candidates. The role of the recruiting consultant</b>			
support, plus support for 2016 NomCom recommendation, and review of firm's effectiveness	ISPCP	support	
	RySG	The RySG supports both the use of a professional recruiting consultant and that the role and purpose of the consultant should be published. The RySG further supports the 2016 NomCom's recommendation for a sub-committee to research alternatives to the incumbent firm. We would like to see the NomCom periodically and transparently review the firm's effectiveness using some of the metrics discussed later in the report and develop a cadence for re-bidding the contract (as a general good business practice).	
agree, so long as ID process is free, fair; limit consultant to +/- 2 years	ALAC	Agree, with the stipulations that (a) the process of identification of the consultant must be free and fair, and (b) the same consultant should not continue for a set number of years (say two years).	
support, + note of need for reporting results	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation. However, we would like to emphasize the need for semi-regular reporting on recruitment success rates (i.e., how many recruits eventually are selected into leadership roles) compared to other means of recruitment.	
agree, but firm should submit all candidates to NomCom; NomCom should be clear about consultant processes	BC	The BC agrees that consultants should continue to identify and assess board candidates. But we believe that consultants should submit their assessments on all candidates to the NomCom, who then decides on candidates meriting a deep-dive. The BC agrees with the Independent Reviewer that what the consultant does, how it does it, and where in the process the handoff to the NomCom occurs are all important information for the NomCom to be clear about.	
<b>Recommendation 6: A professional evaluation consultant should continue to be involved in the evaluation process for Board candidates. The role of the evaluation consultant</b>			
	ISPCP	support	
some considerations, conditions for consultant	RySG	The RySG welcomes more transparency on the role of an evaluation consultant. We are cautiously optimistic that a consultant could provide significant assistance to the NomCom so long as the consultant makes no decisions, uses criteria defined by the NomCom, and the consultant is periodically and transparently evaluated for effectiveness. The report provides thoughtful suggestions, which the RySG supports.	
conditions for consultant	ALAC	Agree, with the stipulations that (a) the process of identification of the consultant must be free and fair, and (b) the same consultant should not continue for a set number of years (say two years).	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation as it provides a good tool to maintain the NomCom's independence.	
agree, but firm should submit all candidates to NomCom; NomCom should be clear about consultant processes	BC	The BC agrees that consultants should continue to identify and assess board candidates. But we believe that consultants should submit their assessments on all candidates to the NomCom, who then decides on candidates meriting a deep-dive. The BC agrees with the Independent Reviewer that what the consultant does, how it does it, and where in the process the handoff to the NomCom occurs are all important information for the NomCom to be clear about.	
<b>Recommendation 7: NomCom members, except for leadership positions, should serve two-year terms, but be limited to a maximum of two terms.</b>			
agree	ISPCP	the current system creates more difficulties than necessary... ISPCP supports the proposal to allow all members to vote with the same time limitation as other members	
agree with 2 years, but not two terms/lifetime	ISPCP	The ISPCP agrees that a two years mandate will allow for more continuity in the process. Regarding the limitation on the number of mandates, the ISPCP believes that limiting to two mandates over a life time is excessive and unnecessary. The ISPCP would prefer to insert a period (like today), where a member cannot be reappointed.	
recommendation may be good, but explore other options	ISPCP	A form of continuity through a 3 years cycle within the leadership team with the Chair elect, Chair and associate Chair is an option, but is not something at this stage that was institutionalized. Other, or additional options could also be explored without introducing too much complexity in the system.	
support for 2-year terms; strongly oppose members serving two consecutive terms; support for one-year leadership terms	RySG	The RySG stands by our comment of Nov 2014 and 'does support the recommendation for two year terms. Nomcom service is a complex responsibility and the additional year will provide necessary experience and continuity.' We maintain the strong opinion that 'no representative should serve two consecutive terms in order to avoid allowing members to be involved in selecting Board members over three consecutive cycles.' We support maintaining the one-year terms for leadership positions (Chair, Chair-Elect and Associate Chair).	
propose 2+1 years if 2+2 years recommendation is not acceptable; suggest staggering appointments	ALAC	ALAC considered the current system of 1+1 years, which we feel is somewhat short, but at the same time, several of us find 2+2 years to be too long (both from locking up a potential leader, and also from making room for others). We would like to propose 2+1 years as an alternative to 2+2 years in case the latter is not acceptable by other constituencies. Further, additional coordination between constituencies to stagger appointments for continuity will also help.	
	RrSG	The RrSG supports NomCom member terms being extended from 1 to 2 years, with the exception of the Chair and Chair-Elect roles...	



Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
consider risks	NCSG	The NCSG does not object to this recommendation. However, there may be some risk that a group of interested parties could gain undue long-term influence in the Nomcom by colluding in some manner. That risk should be taken into consideration if Nomcom member term lengths and limits are revised. Moreover, the perceived problem that extending terms is to remedy is that Nomcom members do not really get "up to speed" until the second year. Because of this, they are unable to leverage that experience...	
<b>Recommendation 8: Maintain the current size of NomCom.</b>			
concern about report analysis	RySG	While the RySG supports maintaining the current size of NomCom based on our own understanding, the report provides no information to allow any reader to be fully informed of the risks or benefits of supporting or opposing the recommendation. We highlight this is one of the areas that is substantively weak on analysis.	
	ALAC	Agree.	
suggest focus on representation over size	NCSG	...suggest refocusing the discussion about the size with proper consideration instead paid to representation. Otherwise, we regard such discussions as meritless.	
<b>Recommendation 9: All NomCom members should be fully participating and voting members, except for NomCom leadership.</b>			
existing voting structure is problematic with respect to the GAC	NR	Whilst the GAC currently do not participate in the Nominating Committee (H2, para 2), the structure remains in place for them so to do. This practice, if maintained, would, I submit, be problematic in any future NomCom that had GAC membership.	
needs additional analysis	SSAC	This change needs additional analysis and consideration by the SSAC and others who would be affected by this change.	
concern about voting rules with respect to the GAC	RySG	The RySG is neutral on allowing RSSAC and SSAC NomCom appointees to vote (with term limits that match other voting members), but doesn't see how the GAC appointee could vote unless the NomCom break the confidentiality rules for that member so they can get instruction from the GAC. The RySG is aware that the GAC itself has never participated on NomCom and is currently discussing if it sees any way it could participate.	
	ALAC	Agree.	
agree	RrSG	The RrSG agrees that all NomComm members should be 'fully participating and voting members, except for NomCom leadership' as there is limited benefit to having non-voting members. However, as stated in the report, this would also necessitate these members being subject the same requirements, notably being term limited.	
	NCSG	The NCSG agrees with this recommendation.	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
does not support	BC	The BC does not support this position. We recommend that the current practice be maintained such that the SSAC, RSSAC and GAC and NomCom leadership remain non-voting members of NomCom. ...	
is being considered	RSSAC	is carefully considering; the RSSAC will make a determination on the voting status of its liaison after the recommendations are more fully vetted by the NomCom, the ICANN Board and its Organizational Effectiveness Committee, the broader ICANN community, and after its own thorough review of the options for this change and the subsequent implications.	
<b>Recommendation 10: Representation on the NomCom should be reviewed every five years, and, if necessary, re-balanced.</b>			
agree	ISPCP	The ISPCP agrees that NomCom should be reflecting the current ICANN organization.	
need more information/substantiation	RySG	The RySG supports establishing a cross-community working group to investigate how well the NomCom represents the community. Given the staggering number of projects ICANN has underway, and the likelihood that any recommendation to re-balance the NomCom is likely to be a significant effort, we do not support establishing a five-year cadence without evidence as to why that number was selected.	
support for recommendation + support for immediate start to first review	ALAC RrSG	Agree. The RrSG supports a five year review of representation on the NomCom and would further support a first review to start immediately.	
support for immediate rebalancing; request for reconsideration of NomCom academic seat	NCSG	The solution for a lack of balance in representation on the NomCom is unsatisfactory... We need this imbalance to be remedied immediately. We therefore ask that the revival of the academic seat on the NomCom be reconsidered.	
address rebalancing as soon as possible	NCSG	... Such concerns as balanced and proper representation must be addressed as soon as possible, therefore, this recommendation must be reconsidered and urgent mechanisms must be suggested to remedy the imbalance.	
<b>Recommendation 11: The senior staff member supporting NomCom should be accountable to and report to the office of the CEO.</b>			
	ISPCP	support	
	RySG	...having the senior staff member supporting NomCom to be as accountable by reporting to a senior office in ICANN is a good idea. ...	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
conditions for support	ALAC	Cautiously agree: Given that the NomCom Chair and Chair-elect report to the BGC, their support Staff reporting to the CEO has the potential to create crossed wires, besides constraining the NomCom leadership. If such issues can be avoided and if the proposed arrangement has the potential to enhance the flexibility of the NomCom, only then it is worth implementing.	
	RrSG	...having the senior staff member supporting NomCom to be as accountable by reporting to a senior office in ICANN is a good idea. ...	
	NCSG	The NCSG agrees with this recommendation.	
<b>Recommendation 12: NomCom Leadership should have input on the NomCom budget and staffing resources.</b>			
	RySG	The RySG supports allowing NomCom leadership to review the budget and identify the NomCom's needs and financial priorities.	
	ALAC	Agree. Given the situation that some ICANN meetings are convened in places where some NomCom members, particularly from At-Large, find it difficult to obtain visas, the NomCom should be allowed to convene their face-to-face meetings in places where it decides and not be forced to follow the ICANN Schedules. This has budget implications. In any case, functional autonomy of the NomCom implies a degree of control over its own budget.	
report recommendation is not the best approach	NCSG	While this recommendation might make sense, giving the NomCom the latitude to spend its budget in whatever way it deems appropriate is not the best approach in our opinion.	
	BC	The BC supports the recommendation that the NomCom leadership should be involved in determining its budget and should have input on allocating resources, while management/staff should retain overall responsibility for the budget.	
<b>Recommendation 13: Publish a "Process Diagram" and codify key elements of the NomCom process. Each year, the NomCom should be required to highlight and explain changes made to its processes to the ICANN community in an open session.</b>			
recommendation needs to be stronger, needs to include accountability	SSAC	Simply "explaining" process changes does not provide the ICANN community with an accountability measure to check and balance the proposed processes that the community finds to be outside acceptable norms. We would like to see a stronger mechanism recommended that would allow the ICANN community to assert some control in this area. At a minimum, a means to block major changes that a majority of the community finds problematic and a process to reconcile them. We note that any process without some sort of accountability measure does not fit into ICANN's values.	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
recommendation may be good, but explore other options	ISPCP	A form of continuity through a 3 years cycle within the leadership team with the Chair elect, Chair and associate Chair is an option, but is not something at this stage that was institutionalized. Other, or additional options could also be explored without introducing too much complexity in the system.	
	RySG	The RySG supports additional transparency and codification of NomCom processes. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree	
recommendation does not go far enough	NCSG	We believe operating procedure changes must not happen at the whim of the NomCom itself ; moreover, the operating procedures and the long-term practices of the NomCom which have become customary must not be changed without consultation with the community.”	
recommendation does not go far enough	NCSG	The NCSG is of the opinion that this recommendation does not fully address the issue, as we have stated in the beginning of this comment. it is not just a matter of visualizing the process as it must be more about making its more transparent and adding safeguards.	
<b>Recommendation 14: Formalize communication between the NomCom and the Board, SO/ACs, and the PTI Board in order to understand needed competencies and experience.</b>			
	ISPCP	support	
	RySG	The RySG supports better communication about competencies and experiences. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree	
	RrSG	... The RrsG therefore supports having formalized communication between the NomCom and the Board, etc.	
support; group inputs should be given equal weight	NCSG	The NCSG agrees with this recommendation, while not giving more weight for any group inputs than others.	
<b>Recommendation 15: The NomCom should continue the practice of publishing detailed job descriptions for the Board, SO/AC, and PTI Board positions. The job descriptions, in</b>			
	ISPCP	support	
	RySG	The RySG supports the continued publication of detailed job description and additional transparency and codification of required competencies. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
agree; wording change suggestion	RrSG	This recommendation states that the NomCom ‘should continue the practise of publishing job descriptions...’, however use of the word “continues” here may be misleading, since this practise was only just implemented by the 2018 NomCom. A reference to the process being newly implemented would be more appropriate.	
	RrSG	In general the RrSG believes publishing job descriptions is good practice to ensure NomCom is held accountable for the choices it ultimately makes.	
	NCSG	The NCSG agrees with this recommendation.	
<b>Recommendation 16: Implement and codify a system for providing feedback to the NomCom regarding the contributions and participation of members up for re-appointment by</b>			
support + suggested adjustments	RySG	The RySG supports establishing a transparent and repeatable system for providing feedback to the NomCom regarding members up for re-appointment. We look forward to participating in implementation, though some members have reservations about making information like Board 360 scorecards available as it could compromise confidentiality. We also support gathering and recording public participation metrics, for instance via the scorecard recommended by the report, that can help support a decision for re-appointment or not.	
	ALAC	Agree	
	RrSG	The RrSG agrees that NomCom should receive feedback on the contribution and participation of members up for re-appointment to ensure that valued members are kept on the Board and SO’s councils.	
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	
<b>Recommendation 17: Maintain current diversity requirements for NomCom appointees.</b>			
	RySG	The RySG supports an overall goal of pushing forward with as much diversity and inclusion as possible.	
we cannot have enough diversity	ALAC	Do Not Agree: Diversity is usually something that we can never have enough of, particularly given the Multistakeholder composition of ICANN. While there may be challenges in increasing NomCom diversity, we have not yet reached a point where the diversity is sufficient (noting that even the Gender diversity requirements are not met during all years).	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
recommendation does not recognize lack of diversity in the NomCom, other types of diversity	NCSG	... it does not recognize that the NomCom is not diverse enough. Diversity of NomCom appointees must go beyond regional diversity and include gender, skills, and perspectives. ...the [survey] question posed had implied that diversity in candidates contradicts with appointment of highly qualified candidates. We would like this mistake to be corrected and for the diversity of the NomCom appointees to go beyond regional diversity... ... reviewers believe that there should be more independent, unaffiliated Directors (Recommendation 26), but they don't see a necessity to have more diversity among NomCom appointees...	
<b>Recommendation 18: Publish a candidate communication schedule and codify a communication process with candidates.</b>			
	RySG	The RySG supports establishing and publishing a communication process with candidates to improve the candidate experience. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree	
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	
<b>Recommendation 19: ICANN staff and the recruitment consultant, along with NomCom members, should leverage the detailed job description and desired competencies and</b>			
	RySG	The RySG supports better marketing for candidates. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree. Here is where an external professional agency can help out	
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	
<b>Recommendation 20: The evaluation consultant should do a preliminary screen of all Board candidates and provide blinded assessments to the NomCom to assist the NomCom</b>			
	RySG	The RySG supports the report's concrete recommendations to set out clear assessment, evaluation, and interview criteria. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
NomCom should do preliminary screen	ALAC	Do Not Agree: The preliminary screening should be done by the NomCom itself (as it was done this year). Besides being fair, this would also be cost-effective. Screening by an external party has [risk] as its effectiveness is not easy to judge.	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
	RrSG	The RrSG strongly supports the implementation of records, matrixes and the standardisation of processes to prevent important and effective institutional memory from being lost due to the regular changeover of NomCom membership. ...	Strong
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	Support
<b>Recommendation 21: The NomCom should use a standardized matrix to evaluate and prioritize candidates, based on desired competencies and experience.</b>			
adapt standardized evaluation to ICANN specificities	ISPCP	The ISPCP wants to point out that ICANN is a very unique organization in its mission and functioning. A standardized evaluation approach doesn't mean this recruiting evaluation approach shouldn't be adapted to ICANN specificities.	
	RySG	The RySG supports the report's concrete recommendations to set out clear assessment, evaluation, and interview criteria. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	Support
try it, if feasible	ALAC	It may not be practically feasible to create such a matrix, but if this can be done to the satisfaction of NomCom members, it could be tried out.	Support
	RrSG	The RrSG strongly supports the implementation of records, matrixes and the standardisation of processes to prevent important and effective institutional memory from being lost due to the regular changeover of NomCom membership. ...	Strong
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	Support
<b>Recommendation 22: The NomCom should provide consistent interview questions and an interviewer evaluation form for the candidates interviewed during the deep-dive phase</b>			
	RySG	The RySG supports the report's concrete recommendations to set out clear assessment, evaluation, and interview criteria. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	Support
	ALAC	Agree if this is feasible.	Support
	RrSG	The RrSG strongly supports the implementation of records, matrixes and the standardisation of processes to prevent important and effective institutional memory from being lost due to the regular changeover of NomCom membership. ...	Strong
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	Support
<b>Recommendation 23: The NomCom should publish additional data on the candidate pool and the recruiting source of candidates.</b>			

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
	RySG	The RySG supports more transparency on NomCom processes, including aggregated metrics on the candidate pool and recruiting. The report lays a good foundation for why this is necessary.	
	ALAC	Agree, subject to GDPR Compliance at all stages of handling personal data.	
	RrSG	The RrSG strongly supports the implementation of records, matrixes and the standardisation of processes to prevent important and effective institutional memory from being lost due to the regular changeover of NomCom membership. ...	
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	
<b>Recommendation 24: Inform assessments of the NomCom by assessing the performance of the Board.</b>			
principally agree, concerns about specifics	RySG	While we are supportive of an ICANN Board that is critical of its own effectiveness and performance, and agree that sharing information about what competencies currently exist and what potentially need to be filled with the NomCom could be helpful in the search for candidates, some RySG members are concerned that sharing the results of a Board self-assessment outside the Board with the NomCom may be ineffective and risks breaches in confidentiality.	
	ALAC	Agree, assuming that the performance of the individual NomCom appointees can be assessed individually.	
support annual assessment + reasons why	RrSG	The Board's effectiveness should be assessed every year to not only improve NomCom's processes, but to also analyse what competencies currently exist and what potentially need to be filled so that these can be kept in mind when looking for candidates.	
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	
<b>Recommendation 25: ICANN should investigate advancing its nominations process into a Leadership Development function.</b>			
support with concerns	RySG	The RySG theoretically supports further Leadership Development, but is also concerned that this would negatively impact ICANN's budget and believe this work should be deprioritized in light of other, more pressing options listed above that are likely to result in a greater positive impact.	
	ALAC	Do Not Agree: This is outside the remit of the NomCom	
	RrSG	The RrSG supports making the most of individuals that, even if not chosen by the NomCom to fill a position, are still able persons who have identified themselves as interested in volunteering to work with ICANN and could potentially have a place in another role.	
	NCSG	The NCSG supports this recommendation.	



Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
agree to a CCWG-developed program	BC	The BC supports this initiative to evolve the current Fellowship program to develop emerging leaders. The current ICANN board has some directors who are products of the fellowship program. A leadership development program is an important element of filling NomCom's objective to appoint high-caliber people. However, such a program should be designed through a cross-community working group and be subject to public comment.	
<b>Recommendation 26: Provide clarity on desire for independent directors and designate three specific seats for "Independent Directors."</b>			
result of implementation may not achieve intent	ISPCP	The ISPCP supports this proposal but is not convinced that "hardcoding" the designation of three specific seats for "Independent Directors" as proposed in recommendation 26 would help or even improve the overall quality of the Board.	
too vague	RySG	This recommendation is too vague for the RySG to either support or oppose.	
works well already	ALAC	Do Not Agree: Currently the NomCom-appointed Directors are a mixture of independent directors and ICANN insiders. There is no reason to further "harden" this structure as the current system seems to be working reasonably well.	
clarify, decide about independent directors first	RrSG	The RrSG believes that it must be first decided and agreed upon as to whether the NomCom should be seeking Independent Directors, and if that is the case, then this should be added to the ICANN Bylaws.	
need more clarification	NCSG	The NCSG would like more clarification here. The premise that bringing on unaffiliated directors will foster more independence within the ICANN Board is questionable. Clear guidelines on what an independent director is in the ICANN context would help the Nomcom recruitment and selection process.	
no support for candidates with little prior ICANN experience	BC	The BC does not support the recommendation to designate 3 ICANN board seats for candidates "with limited prior ICANN experience." In our view, board members without prior ICANN experience must typically devote the first half of their term just to build an understanding of what ICANN does and how it does its work.	
<b>OTHER/OVERALL:</b>			
overall	NR	Therefore, overall, and in general, I cordially support the Report and Conclusions, but with reservations...	
overall	SSAC	The SSAC concurs with the full set of important findings and recommendations in this report and hopes the NomCom leadership will act quickly on these.	
overall	ISPCP	Regarding the main recommendations contained in the report, the ISPCP supports these recommendations...	

Recommendation	Responding Organization	Comment / Summary of Comment	Level of Support
overall	RySG	The RySG supports the report's general themes of: more training for NomCom members about how to review, select and interview candidates; more process documentation to encourage efficient transitions and knowledge transfer; improved documentation and communication about core competencies; and standardized screenings, evaluations, and interviews (to improve consistency).	
overall	RySG	the RrSG supports the final report overall	
overall + new ideas	RrSG	In summary, the RrSG endorses the findings and recommendations of the NomCom2 Review Working Party with the addition of a Standing Committee. Once the Final Report is published, we look forward to making more contributions during the feasibility and implementation phases of the review process.	
overall	BC	The BC supports the conclusion by the Independent reviewer that there is a continuing purpose for the NomCom in the ICANN structure.	
overall	IPC	...general support for the proposed recommendations in the report...	

Recommendation	Responding Organization & Level of Support	Comment / Summary of Comment
----------------	--	------------------------------

Key						
Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Partly/Conditionally Support	Support	Strongly Support	New Idea/Suggestion

OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS		
	RySG	The RySG supports the additional recommendation suggested by the RrSG to create a Standing Committee that exists in parallel to the annual NomCom comprised of ex-NomCom and/or ex-Board members and perhaps even the current NomCom Chair Elect or Associate Chair.
reiteration of earlier recommendation	RySG	The RySG wishes to reiterate its 2014 recommendation that current or former NomCom members who have served on NomCom with individuals under consideration for Chair roles should be consulted during deliberations concerning their candidacies.
criticism of report	RySG	(Rec. 8) the report provides no information to allow any reader to be fully informed of the risks or benefits of supporting or opposing the recommendation. We highlight this is one of the areas that is substantively weak on analysis.
criticism of report	RySG	(Rec. 9) The report does not articulate why the NomCom was structured this way (no voting, no term limits), what the benefits are, and what the drawbacks are. It does not include any analysis of what benefits or risks might arise from this recommended change. The report appears to rely on the argument “that’s not how other boards work.” C38
new idea = consider ICANN org staff reporting to Human Resources instead of CEO	RySG	(Rec. 11) We agree with the suggestion also made by the RrSG that given that the NomCom’s role is primarily one of recruitment, the VP of Human Resources should be considered as an alternative to the CEO office.
criticism of report	RySG	(Rec. 11) We observe an analytical disconnect between the finding that the NomCom is understaffed and the recommendation is that the senior NomCom staffer should report to the CEO. We interpreted this recommendation to mean if the NomCom budget gets higher visibility in the ICANN org, then such issues as staffing might be addressed, but it would have been helpful for the report to have made that connection.
criticism of report	RySG	(Rec. 17) We highlight that this is another example of where the report discusses what some interviewers thought, but then made a recommendation with little to no analysis. The recommendation here is unsupported by any rationale for why a goal to increase diversity will be unproductive. Diversity can be achieved through more than quotas.

Recommendation	Responding Organization & Level of Support	Comment / Summary of Comment
criticism of report	RySG	(Rec. 17) ...we observe that the findings section seems to imply that NomCom must choose EITHER highquality OR diverse candidates. We believe that the NomCom and its consultants can do better to achieve candidates that are BOTH high-quality and diverse.
Rec 1 implementation suggestion	RySG	(Rec. 19) ...the report doesn't go far enough, implying that simply notifying candidates of openings will numerically increase diversity (geographic, gender, and ICANN-experience). We suggest that, in implementing Recommendation 1, NomCom should select a vendor based on their reputation for drafting job descriptions that recognize and account for hidden bias against diverse candidates, and who have special expertise in outreach to diverse pools of candidates, thereby reducing the likelihood that they will self-select out.
request for more information	RySG	(Rec. 26) We would like more information on why the report recommends a quota of Independent Directors and where did "3" come from? Previously the benchmark was "high-quality" candidates (Recommendation 17).
new idea = use a scorecard for evidence of independence, if desired	RySG	(Rec. 26) Perhaps instead a scorecard could be used to prioritize evidence of independence in all candidates, if that is a desired outcome.
NomCom...should be much more accountable to the community	ALAC	1. As noted in the report, the ICANN NomCom is different in its function compared to most other Nominating Committees. The ICANN NomCom is more of a Selection Committee than the generic Nominating Committee (see: <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Committee#Nominating_committee">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Committee#Nominating_committee</a> ), whose main task assigned is to identify a slate of candidates for different positions, which is then voted on by the membership. In this way the NomCom subsumes some of the membership's powers, and consequently, it should be much more accountable to the community.
It is not possible to know if the process is being 'gamed'	ALAC	2. A significant related concern is that since the NomCom is a much smaller group of people (than the membership), whether it is possible for a small group of NomCom members to 'game' the candidate selection process. In this regard, the somewhat opaque and confidential nature of NomCom processes makes it difficult for a NomCom member to refer to even her appointing constituency if in case of doubt.
Accountability and the potential for 'gaming' should be addressed now	ALAC	3. The current review has steered clear of both the above concerns. As an independent, autonomous organization, ICANN would be subject to more intense public scrutiny in future, and perhaps it's important to dispel any doubts on these important issues.

Recommendation	Responding Organization & Level of Support	Comment / Summary of Comment
The "firewall" between consecutive NomCom's is not desirable.	ALAC	4. The current practice is for each NomCom to start "on a clean slate" as far as its operations are concerned. In order to retain and re-use the best practices of previous NomComs, it is suggested that a living document on NomCom best practices be maintained by Staff with inputs reviewed by the NomCom leadership. The "firewall" between consecutive NomComs is not desirable, particularly since a number of members would be common between the two.
Adopt transparency where possible, for ICANN's best interests.	ALAC	5. Confidentiality has been an important part of NomCom's functioning. While confidentiality needs to be maintained at the core, wherever open, transparent processes can be adopted, they should be. An opaque NomCom is not in the best interests of an otherwise open, transparent, bottom-up Multistakeholder organization such as ICANN.
resume NomCom member 360 evaluations	ALAC	6. The 360-degree evaluations that used to be carried out for each NomCom member and for the leadership team have not found a place in the review recommendations. If provided in time, these may be useful for the NomCom to provide feedback to the appointing constituencies on the performance of their appointees. A single composite score aggregating individual scores may also be useful in assigning an overall evaluation for the whole NomCom. The practice should therefore be continued.
ensure GDPR compliance	ALAC	7. Since NomCom collects a great deal of personal data from individual applicants, it needs to ensure compliance with the requirements of GDPR.
training should focus on understanding of ICANN, non-verbal cues over specific skills	ALAC	As a general point, members of NomCom should be rather guided to understand the broad ecosystem of ICANN, the challenges it faces and the leadership that it requires, rather than provide them only with specific skills. In particular, the importance of non-verbal cues such as body language, which may require specialized training.
new idea = create a Standing Committee	RrSG	... the RrSG believes there is a need to create a Standing Committee that exists in parallel to the annual NomCom comprised of ex-NomCom and/or ex-Board members and perhaps even the current NomCom Chair Elect or Associate Chair...
reiteration of earlier recommendation	NCSG	Frequent changes in Operating Procedures
	NCSG	A more effective solution would be to form a standing committee to oversee NomCom.
notification of issue not satisfactorily addressed	NCSG	Imbalances in representation
notification of issue not satisfactorily addressed	NCSG	Dismissal of members of the NomCom

Recommendation	Responding Organization & Level of Support	Comment / Summary of Comment
	NCSG	if the leadership of the NomCom is allowed to carry out such dismissals it must do so based on pre-established criteria and explain on what grounds it has dismissed the member. We are wary of the NomCom being able to dismiss members on its own with no recourse to due process. There must also be an appeals mechanism in place when such dismissals occur, and greater transparency around the rationales for the actions of the NomCom leadership.
notification of issue not satisfactorily addressed	NCSG	Confidentiality used as an excuse for not being transparent and accountable
operating procedure update to clarify scope of confidentiality	NCSG	We suggest an addition to the operating procedure to make it clear that only deliberations about “candidates” are confidential and the members can freely discuss their concerns about process with the community.
establish/develop formal communications channels	NCSG	Formal communication channels between the community and the NomCom must continue to be developed or established to accomplish this.
NomCom training for leadership	NCSG	...NomCom leaders can benefit from [ICANN Chairing Skills] course if it is still in place. If not, it should be offered again in the future.
codify rules	NCSG	(Rec. 7) ... an alternative solution is to improve the situation by codifying operational rules, e.g., around decision making processes, making it easier for new members (and frankly, the broader community) to clearly understand how the Nomcom works in advance of serving.
new idea = create a Standing Committee	NCSG	(Rec. 12) An independent standing committee might be able to provide a solution to this and prevent NomCom from spending the money on matters that are not priority.
Reference to review scope/Bylaws	BC	The BC supports the conclusion by the Independent reviewer that there is a continuing purpose for the NomCom in the ICANN structure.
disagreement with IE findings re: policies, processes	BC	The Independent reviewers contend that NomCom policies and processes limit the extent to which the NomCom is able to identify competencies needed in ICANN leadership positions, recruit candidates based on those needed competencies, and identify candidates that best fulfill those needed competencies. The BC disagrees with this contention. We believe that NomCom has adequate processes and access to sufficient ICANN Org resources to achieve its mandated task.
incorporate public comment feedback into final report recommendations	IPC	[Analysis Group's final report] should provide more useful recommendations through incorporating public comment in advance of Analysis Group’s settling on recommendations.
new idea = create a Standing Committee	IPC	IPC supports the creation of a NomCom standing Committee that would operate in parallel to the NomCom which would be populated by former NomCom members as well as ex-Board Members.