

## ICANN SIC Board Review WG Interim report Comments from the ISPCP constituency

The ISPCP constituency is pleased to provide the following comments focusing on 3 key points of the report.

**1. The WG recognises the complexity of the issues associated with Recommendation 1 “Reduce the size of the Board”. It sees value in the arguments to reduce the size of the Board but has no firm views on how this might be made to work in the ICANN context. The WG seeks the views of the community on this issue.**

- This recommendation is to be seen in context with the other ICANN organizational reviews and implementations (in particular At Large/ALAC and GNSO reform). It means that the question of the board size should be solved before taking any further decisions with regards to new board seat allocations.
- Reduction of the board size would not appear to offer some advantage regarding efficiency and manageability if the board’s workload. The ICANN board has a very significant workload to deal with, with an increasingly complex set of issues and challenges to be duly considered and dealt with. Also global geographical and stakeholder group diversity remains as a must for the board constitution. In addition the board visibility towards the community and the various stakeholder groups is essential, in particular during ICANN meetings. By weighing up these arguments we do not see any real reason to reduce the size of the board at present.
- A different question is the distribution of board seats provided by the different SO’s and the potential reduction of seats provided through the NomCom process. This should furthermore be investigated in light of the increasing engagement of new constituencies and stakeholder groups.
- In case At Large is provided a voting seat at board level ALAC – as being the representative body for At Large – should be excluded from the right to apply for board seats through the GNSO council mechanism. Otherwise this could open the possibility for additional representativeness.
- Due to the arguments above option 2 (halve the size of the board) should not be implemented.

**5. The issues contained in Recommendation 5 “Make Board membership more sustainable” are complex, and in particular the WG seeks the views of the community on a number of aspects related to Board remuneration and the timing of the seating of Board members.**

The matter of workload and the significant demand this places on board members’ time, suggest remuneration for all board members be considered. Should remuneration be favourably considered, the chairperson should be remunerated at a higher level than other board members. On the other hand, remuneration could raise some concerns with regards to the independence of board members, but this factor should not preclude at least awarding remuneration to the chairperson.

**8. The WG supports the initiatives suggested in Recommendation 8 “Clarify the Board’s accountabilities”.**

Point (f) of the related recommendation says: “Consider the proposition that the stakeholder groups get together to appoint a board acceptable to all of them – rather than directly appointing their own representatives to the board.”

To achieve this appears as solving the Gordian knot. Question is: who has the right sword?