

Statement from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Chair, 2014 NomCom

In the later part of the 2013 Nominating Committee's activities the ICANN Board Governance Committee (BGC) requested that as an aid to their determination the effectiveness of the Chair Elect to serve as Chair in the following year's NomCom, the BGC would conduct a peer review or 360 Review process with an external consulting company for both the Chair and Chair Elect.

In 2014 this practice was continued and completed during August. Stéphane Van Gelder (Chair Elect) and I agreed that as the feedback from such an exercise is not only a useful tool for personal development of our leadership skills and behavior styles, as well as a tool for assessment of performance of the Chair and Chair Elect by the BGC, but is also a mechanism for use in our accountability to the wider ICANN Community and that in keeping with the current NomCom aim of continued improvement in our practices and particularly our transparency; we have requested our reports be made available for public review.

**ICANN
NOMCOM LEADERSHIP 360° EVALUATIONS REPORT
FOR CHERYL LANGDON-ORR**

Submitted by
TTG Consultants
4520 Wilshire Blvd.; Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90010
323.936.6600
d.bowman@ttgconsultants.com

ICANN NOMCOM LEADERSHIP 360° EVALUATIONS REPORT FOR CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

The following is a Summary of a 360° Survey containing evaluation ratings for the current ICANN Nominating Committee Chair, Cheryl Landon-Orr. There were two parts to the evaluation process...

1. A written 360° Survey/Evaluation
2. An in-person interview with evaluators/raters by telephone

These Surveys/Evaluations were conducted during August, 2014.

Evaluators/Raters

Twenty two evaluators were invited to evaluate (including the individual being evaluated). Of the twenty two, one opted out of the process and seven did not complete the evaluation process. Fourteen completed the full process, including the online evaluation, as well as a one-on-one interview.

THE ON-LINE, WRITTEN 360° SURVEY

Methodology for the On-Line, 360° Written Survey

The Written Survey was completed on-line. It contained 11 questions.

Each question could be answered by indicating one of the following five rating responses...

- A. Strongly Agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly Disagree

The questions asked for a rating response about the following...

1. Demonstrates Integrity.
2. Participates in an open and honest manner.
3. Demonstrates good judgment.
4. Effectively uses influence in an appropriate manner.
5. Is an effective leader.
6. Is a good listener.
7. Individual treats others with respect.

8. Takes responsibility and is accountable for ensuring the nominating committee meets its timelines.
9. Demonstrates impartiality and neutrality.
10. Demonstrates an understanding of the values a nominating committee appointee would add to each of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO.
11. Demonstrates an understanding of the criteria for selection of nominating committee appointees to each of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO.

Each evaluator/rater also was invited to provide a detailed explanation of “why” each rating response was made.

Meanings of the Written 360° Survey Rating Ratios

Overall Ratings

The Survey provides for a maximum overall response rating of 55 (the highest possible) which would mean the person being rated received “A” rating responses on every question by all evaluators/raters.

Thus, an overall rating of **55 / 55** would mean a score of all “A” rating responses on every question by all evaluators/raters.

Individual Question Ratings

Each of the 11 questions has a maximum rating of 5. Thus, a **5.0** would mean that all evaluators/raters provided an “A” rating response on that specific question.

Written 360° Survey Rating Responses of the Chair

The pages that follow indicate the Written 360° Survey ratings and their explanations for the individuals being rated: the Chair, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Included are anonymous excerpts (detailed explanations of “why” rating responses were made) from each question in the written comments section of the Survey. In order to protect the anonymity of all evaluators/raters, many of their specific words have been changed, but their comment meanings/contexts remain intact.

THE IN-PERSON / TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

Methodology for the In-Person / Telephone Interviews

The following questions were asked of each of the interviewees:

1. “Please elaborate on your answers to each of the questions and issues in the 360° Survey Questionnaires for Cheryl Langdon-Orr.”

2. “As viewed and perceived from your NomCom experience, please describe Cheryl Langdon-Orr’s...
 - a. *Leadership Style* (how she leads other people and teams),
 - b. *Management Style* (how she manages projects and issues),
 - c. *Operating Style* (how she gets things done, such as accomplishes tasks)?”

In addition, each interviewee was invited to elaborate on any other relevant topic.

WRITTEN 360° SURVEY RATING RESPONSES FOR CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Average Overall Rating: 49.5 / 55. Responses were: 102 “A” responses (Strongly Agree), 45 “B” (Agree) responses, 16 “C” (Neutral) responses, 2 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Question #1 (Demonstrates Integrity): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 8 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 6 “B” (Agree) responses, 1 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no “Self” explanation/commentary.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl has the best interest of ICANN at heart. She does not appear to have a hidden agenda, or to be promoting other interests. Cheryl is a person of high integrity – in her acts, her speech and in her relations with all. There is no evidence to show that Cheryl has a lack of integrity. Cheryl conducted the NomCom team with a great sense of ethics – there was no discrimination between members or candidates. She adopted a neutral position throughout the NomCom process and kept her personal biases, if any, very much out of sight.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There was one instance in which Cheryl had a lapse of integrity as a result of a personal perspective on a specific candidate.

Question #2 (Participates in an Open and Honest Manner): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 8 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 7 “B” (Agree)

responses, 0 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no “Self” explanation/commentary.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

All discussions were on a straight-forward basis, and Cheryl was able to guide them because of her open and transparent method of facilitation. She always explained at length any actions being taken. Totally open personality. She is very open in her views and expresses herself in the most honest way she can. Cheryl made sure every NomCom member understood the rules and regulations – and she took the time to ensure this occurred.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #3 (Demonstrates Good Judgment): **4.4** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 8 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 5 “B” (Agree) responses, 2 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no “Self” explanation/commentary.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl always made appropriate administrative decisions, in consultation with members. The fact that NomCom’s work was done well and on-time is testament to the fact that decision making was effective and efficient, which in turn was based on good judgment from the Leadership team. Cheryl handles well all personalities with whom she interfaces. She is a good judge of people, which means she is able to assemble good teams. Cheryl has long experience with the ICANN environment – which helps her understand its requirements. She analyzed decisions effectively, based on rules, procedures and member participation.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were instances of leaked information – and there was no follow-up to ensure non re-occurrence. Nor were there regular reminders to members about the need for confidentiality of NomCom information.

Question #4 (Effectively Uses Influence in an Appropriate Manner): **4.0** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 6 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 4 “B” (Agree) responses, 4 “C” (Neutral) responses, 1 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no “Self” explanation/commentary.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl absolutely uses her influence properly. She is very strong willed. Though some may consider Cheryl a bit to bossy, she uses her influence in a positive, though strong, way – and she leads others to do everything that needs to be done. She has a good leadership style. Cheryl used her influence in a very consensus manner. She used smart strategies to influence decisions by laying out the facts (the pros and cons) and by allowing the members to make final decisions through the voting process.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

Cheryl tends to bully others in an attempt to have them follow her lead. She is an autocratic Chairperson, but at the same time, she presses forward on issues that she feels are important to the process. In one instance, Cheryl acquiesced to a candidate’s busy schedule, preventing a possible second round of interviews.

Question #5 (Is an Effective Leader): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 10 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 3 “B” (Agree) responses, 2 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no “Self” explanation/commentary.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

When she began her Chair position, Cheryl was excellent at keeping discussions focused, as well as channeling members who simply talked in order to be heard; however, she became less effective at this as the year progressed. She has uncommon leadership skills. Cheryl is effective at leading a group through fairly non-confrontational processes. She was effective at reaching the goals set for the NomCom. Cheryl is a good leader who can create an environment of joy and friendship among group members. She has made an effort to be less bossy than is perhaps her natural way. Cheryl has a strong personality and has demonstrated her leadership skills by steering the NomCom through different challenges and by finishing the job on time. Cheryl ensured that each job was accomplished with maximum participation from the members. She is a leader by nature.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

Cheryl was not as effective at making the members under her leadership feel as though she was listening to them. She exerts strong pressure to ensure things are done in the way she believes is best. She could try to be less bossy. She could be a better leader if she were more studied in her approach to leadership.

Question #6 (Is a Good Listener): **4.3** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 8 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 5 "B" (Agree) responses, 1 "C" (Neutral) responses, 1 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no "Self" explanation/commentary.

Others' explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl gave the impression that she was focused on what each person was saying. She gave the appropriate attention to the question and to the debate that followed. She performed quite well in this regard. Cheryl listens and even repeats a member's comments in order to ensure understanding.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

Cheryl has a tendency to make subtle, almost inaudible, comments when others are speaking ("uh-huh, huumm, ooohhh"). Although she may not be aware of making such comments, these kinds of utterances have an impact on those around her (within hearing

range), as well as on the person speaking. Listening is not Cheryl's best competency.

Question #7 (Treats Others with Respect): **4.4** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 8 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 5 "B" (Agree) responses, 2 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no "Self" explanation/commentary.

Others' explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl took the advice of committee members. She managed conference calls well. On the whole, she is respectful. She uses respectful words and phrases – even when making a joke – to ensure others feel comfortable. Cheryl and the NomCom membership value the opinions of newcomers, as well as opinions of longer standing members. Normally, she is very respectful of other people.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

If Cheryl has other issues (to say or do) on her mind, she can be surprisingly short and abrupt with those who are speaking or would like to speak. If she senses obstructionist opinions surfacing, she can be rude in her comments. Cheryl tends to speak when others are speaking (interrupting them), which can be very annoying for them. Because she is very assertive, others may feel they are not being treated with respect.

Question #8 (Takes Responsibility and is Accountable for Ensuring the Nominating Committee Meets Its Timelines): **4.7** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 12 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 2 "B" (Agree) responses, 1 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no "Self" explanation/commentary.

Others' explanations:

Positive...

The process was managed adequately, given the compressed timelines. Cheryl made the process work absolutely on schedule. She defined how the best result would look. Cheryl demonstrated excellent leadership in terms of planning for the teams, sub-teams and meetings, and she made sure the work was completed in a timely manner. She made it quite clear that there would be no timeline extensions. Timelines drove the entire process. Cheryl stated that she would not be the Chair who did not meet timelines.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

It would have been beneficial to have had all timelines/deadlines shared at the outset, allowing for adjustments to be made as needed. The timeline process could have been more succinct.

Question #9 (Demonstrates Impartiality and Neutrality): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 9 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 4 "B" (Agree) responses, 2 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no "Self" explanation/commentary.

Others' explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl sometimes inserted a comment which came from her personal knowledge, to support or counter a point under discussion, but this always occurred appropriately and never as an initial contribution. On the whole, she demonstrated impartiality and neutrality. No partiality was apparent – she seemed neutral most of the time. She treated all members equally. She ensured that each member was heard and that their view was considered. She never imposed her opinion relating to candidates – a very important element of the Chair's responsibility.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were a few occasions on which she could have been more impartial.

Question #10 (Demonstrates an Understanding of the Values a Nominating Committee Appointee Would Add to Each of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO): **4.7** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 12 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 2 "B" (Agree) responses, 1 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no "Self" explanation/commentary.

Others' explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl has a great deal of empirical knowledge about ICANN, and she uses this knowledge to help others understand and deal with the demands of their positions. She used her considerable knowledge of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO to guide the discussions among members.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #11 (Demonstrates an Understanding of the Criteria for Selection of Nominating Committee Appointees to Each of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO): **4.9** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 13 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 2 "B" (Agree) responses, 0 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

There was no "Self" explanation/commentary.

Others' explanations:

Positive...

Cheryl was able to adequately describe and distinguish appointee roles. She knew this information "by the book." She participated as a full member in the definition of selection criteria for each of the NomCom appointees. Her considerable experience and past interactions with different constituencies within ICANN enabled her to have a fairly deep understanding of the requirements for each stakeholder group. Cheryl never goes casually or superficially into any task she needs to perform. She demonstrated strong and clear understanding of all the issues relating to NomCom, her role within NomCom, other roles, processes, etc.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were not comments or suggestions.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESPONSES FOR CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Individual comments included...

Leadership Style (how she leads other people/members and teams):

Positive...

Cheryl has a very strong personality and leadership style. She has a combination of leadership styles, each used depending on circumstances. She is clearly an “alpha” leader by nature. Cheryl handles both calls and face-to-face meetings very well. She is a very strong leader, who motivates others to participate. Cheryl knows how to lead in a tough way. She also knows how to get along with people, in a very straight-forward manner. She ensures everyone is involved and is heard. Cheryl is a very good leader, in that she seeks others’ opinions, thoughts and impressions. She is a dominant and assertive leader, although not overbearing. She knows how to be effective at leading others, and she remains “on-focus” with timelines and the requirements of issues. Cheryl is a natural leader, in that she knows how to bring people together. She is humorous and frequently engages in kidding to create a friendly environment. During this past cycle, Cheryl has appeared less bossy and more consensus-focused than previously. She is very focused on objectives. She understands the political context of ICANN and the NomCom, and has guided members accordingly. Cheryl has a very strong personality, and does not fear to speak out. She clearly knows what she wants, but brings others’ views to the forefront as well. She is politically sensitive and handles political situations very well.

Needs Improvement/Development...

Cheryl can be a bully – she shouts and can be dismissive of other people. On occasion, she has been dismissive of Stéphane. Her style often is overbearing and omnipresent.

Management Style (how she manages projects and issues):

Positive...

She has a real focus on meeting timelines and deadlines. It’s always about the deadlines – they WILL be met. She is a compassionate, consensus manager. Cheryl takes the time to understand different cultures and perspectives, and gets to consensus. She has a focus on consensus in decision making. Cheryl handles conflict between others by asking questions and finding the “interests” of each party. She listens, and therefore she is able to appropriately delegate tasks to others. Cheryl manages challenges quite well, by analyzing the end and intermediate

goals and requirements of a project. She understands how to straddle time zone issues. She is inclusive; she delegates and shares responsibilities; she takes responsibility for her work. Cheryl always allows members to raise issues. She led what is essentially a United Nations group into a well-oiled and productive team.

Needs Improvement/Development...

Sometimes, Cheryl can be more concerned about the deadlines than with the quality of the project. She does not delegate well. She appears to have a lack of neutrality at times.

Operating Style (how she gets things done, such as accomplishes tasks):

Positive...

Cheryl has a highly cooperative and delegative style. She is a realist – “It’s here, so let’s deal with it.” She listens well, and provides comment/disagreement time from others. Cheryl is very sensitive to time and deadlines. She is quite conscious of better ways to do things. She tries to improve, based on feedback. Cheryl makes certain things get done. She creates efficiency through imposing timelines and then asking for feedback. She listens well, and repeats what others say with, “Did I hear you say...?” Cheryl is warm, caring and quite approachable. She is very good at seeing the “big picture” regarding issues; she is “hands-on”, great at timelines and extinguishes fires quickly. She does not over-react; she remains calm and methodical most of the time. Cheryl handles pressure calmly. She seeks others’ input before announcing her own opinions, and ensures participation by all. Cheryl is a stickler for deadlines. She listens well, but certainly has her own opinions. She is very good at “process” and “getting it done” by following timelines, assigning accountability and involving all members. Cheryl has a great deal of energy. She drives the NomCom hard through weekly meetings – to get results. Cheryl is very detail-focused, and nobody is confused as to what she wants and how she wants it. She knows how to motivate people to get their work done on time. Cheryl accepts feedback very well. She provides good summaries of discussions. Cheryl tries to shape change to her vision. She embraces/welcomes change and adapts to it well. She brought excellent results, given the tight timetable on many issues. She moved the NomCom process along smoothly. Cheryl handles the pressure about deadlines very well.

Needs Improvement/Development...

She spends too much time talking in conferences. She often creates a bit of drama, albeit charming on occasion, and is certainly not a minimalist in communicating with others. She talks too much, although this trait seems to have diminished somewhat during the past year. Cheryl is terrible at

keeping to agendas and timelines in meetings – they seem to be meaningless – and she becomes mired in details, which derails meeting agendas.

Other Comments:

There should be an “opt out” provision for members in the polling process. Total project timelines should be written out at the start of a project. Focus groups should be assembled to discuss changes in By-Laws revisions. There are no rules about how sub-committees work and operate. There should be a distribution of votes by applicant (but maintain anonymity of members’ votes).