

# **AFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENTS ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY REVIEW TEAM SELECTION FACTORS**

## **Introduction**

Under the affirmation of commitments (see [www.icann.org/en/affirmation/appointments](http://www.icann.org/en/affirmation/appointments) the Chairman of the Board and the Chairman of the GAC act as selectors of the review team into ICANN's performance of its obligations in accountability and transparency. Acting in that capacity, I have worked with the Chairman of the GAC (Ambassador Janis Karklins from Latvia) and between us we have selected the team.

A draft proposal for the conduct of this review was posted on 26 December 2009 (see [www.icann.org/en/reviews/affirmation/affirmation-reviews-draft-proposal-26dec09-en.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/reviews/affirmation/affirmation-reviews-draft-proposal-26dec09-en.pdf)). Public comment in response to that proposal (see <http://forum.icann.org/lists/affrev-draft-processes/>) included requests for team selectors to post the rationale for their eventual selections.

Publication of reasons seems inherently apposite to a review of ICANN's accountability and transparency.

## **Rationale**

I approached the selection of this team by considering the high level purpose of the reviews – which is to ensure accountability and transparency and that the interests of global Internet users are protected, and that ICANN decisions should be made in the public interest.

The particular aspects of ICANN's performance which are being specifically reviewed are summarised as follows:

- a) Assessing and improving governance by the ICANN Board including evaluating the Board's selection process, the Board's performance, and considering an appeal mechanism from Board decisions.
- b) Assessing and improving the process of receiving public input to decision making, and the explanation of those decisions.
- c) Assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported by the community.
- d) Assessing the policy development process itself.

## **Appropriate skill sets**

Accordingly, it seemed to me that the following skills were required:

1. An appreciation of Board governance matters, including techniques and processes for reviewing and improving Board performance; familiarity with Board selection, induction and training processes ("Board").

2. An understanding of the relationship between the Board and the GAC, and the latter's role in providing public policy advice in the private sector led, multi-stakeholder organisation which is ICANN ("GAC").
3. Understanding the policy development processes in ICANN, including input, decision making, decision announcing and decision acceptance and implementation in the ICANN context ("Policy").
4. Experience in conducting institutional (preferably corporate) reviews; familiarity with review issue analysis, report writing, use of expert assistance ("Review").
5. General experience of ICANN, and the eco system that it operates in ("Familiarity").
6. A general category of other skills including opportunities for legal, regulatory, technical, social, political, communication or other talent to be applied ("Skills").
7. Looking for geographic community and gender balance ("Balance").

### **Weightings**

It seemed to me that the first three (Board, GAC, and Policy) were of the primary importance, and accordingly I have weighted these in my assessments as worth 20% each of the final total. Review skills were close behind, and I weighted that 15%, with familiarity and skills coming in at 10% each. Balance was 5%: an opportunity for gender, ethnicity, geographic balance etc to have some influence. "Skills" turned out to be no basis for discriminating: all candidates brought high levels of useful skills.

### **Representatives**

The affirmation required that team members be, in addition to the ex officio members, "representatives of the relevant ICANN advisory committees and supporting organisations".

Each AC and SO was responsible for developing its own processes for establishing representativeness, and I acknowledge the efforts undertaken by the ACs and SOs to comply with this request.

A considerable number of volunteers self nominated through this process, and I extend my thanks to them all. In the end, consideration was only given to those that were endorsed as representatives of their respective communities. Those considered, and the scores I allocated are set out in the attached table.

### **Improving the process**

Selection by these means is not an exact science, and the assessments against these scores are the best effort possible under the circumstances. No individual interviews were conducted with applicants. Some applicants filed more detailed CVs than others and, inevitably, some applicants and their qualifications are personally better known to me than

others. My scoring system was not published in advance. Doubtless there are other ways in which the process could be improved.

These reviews will be repeated in future and I hope that we will continue to improve the selection process for future reviews. Again, my thanks to all those who volunteered to take part in this important exercise.