



AFRALO COMMENTS ON NOMCOM REBALANCING

See:

<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/sinha-to-ojedeji-26apr23-en.pdf>

1. What does it mean to have a balanced NomCom at a point in time? For example,
 - What criteria would you apply to measure or assess whether the NomCom is balanced? And further
To be balanced, we think that the composition of the NomCom should be related to:
 - the SO/ACs to which the NomCom appoints leaders
 - the community Irepresented by these SO/ACs
 - All SO/ACs to be represented on the NomCom
 - How can one test whether or not the NomCom is balanced?
The metrics might be:
 - Are SO/ACs to which the NomCom appoints leaders well represented?
 - Does the number of delegates by SO/AC translate the importance of the respective community represented by each of these SO/ACs?
 - Are All SO/ACs represented on the NomCom?
2. Do you support the view that the current composition of the NomCom needs to be rebalanced? Please explain why or why not.
The current composition of the NomCom is not badly balanced, but could be better shaped
 - In fact, all the SO/ACs are represented, the SO/ACs to which the NomCom appoints leaders have reasonable representation but the number of delegates by SO/AC doesn't translate the importance of the respective communities represented by each of these SO/ACs. Besides, the delegates of 3 of the ACs are non-voting ones.
3. How frequently does the balance need to be measured or assessed?
Every 5 years is a reasonable period
4. How do you suggest that the NomCom's composition be rebalanced?
The NomCom appoints:
 - ⇒ ICANN Board Directors
 - ⇒ PTI Board Directors
 - ⇒ GNSO council members
 - ⇒ ccNSO council members

⇒ ALAC members

The NomCom by definition is independent from the ICANN Board and PTI Board. So, GNSO, ccNSO and ALAC should be well represented on the NomCom. ASO, being a supporting organization should also be reasonably represented on the NomCom.

The other advisory committees (GAC, SSAC & RSSAC), as well as the IETF can be represented by one delegate each.

If we want to rebalance the NomCom we can apply vote weighting in the manner below:

- ⇒ 3 votes with max 5 delegates from the GNSO
- ⇒ 3 votes with max 5 delegates from the ccNSO
- ⇒ 3 votes with max 5 delegates from the At-Large
- ⇒ 2 votes with max 3 delegates from the ASO
- ⇒ 1 vote with 1 delegate from the IETF
- ⇒ 1 vote with 1 delegate from the GAC
- ⇒ 1 vote with 1 delegate from the SSAC
- ⇒ 1 vote with 1 delegate from the RSSAC

Which gives a total number of the NomCom weighted votes to be equal to 15 (same number of current NomCom voting members). Though number of delegates could increase to max 22 persons

In the proposed vote weighting and composition above, At-large for instance has 5 regions hence will have representation from all regions but will collectively have a vote weight of 3. This will also encourage better coordination within an SO or AC. It will also create a better balance within nomcom

5. Who should conduct this work, and how should it be conducted?

A periodic review of the NomCom done by a community working group could be the best way to conduct the rebalancing operation.

6. How would your community group prioritize consideration of this issue within your planning efforts?

This is not the highest priority for AFRALO, but it deserves to be addressed to improve the efficiency of the NomCom