

April 30, 2016

These comments are submitted personally by Thomas Barrett, President of EnCirca, and do not necessarily represent the views of the overall ICANN Nominating Committee. Tom is a NomCom16 member as the elected representative of the Registrar Stakeholder Group for 2016.

The FY17 Draft budget includes a line item of \$900,000 for the Nominating Committee's (NomCom) FY17 activities. However, the current NomCom members were not consulted to provide any input or guidance regarding this Draft FY17 NomCom budget.

My understanding is that this lack of communication with the NomCom for the annual NomCom budget process is a long-established practice. Essentially, the ICANN Board is placing every incoming NomCom Board at an immediate disadvantage by not asking their predecessors for budget guidance for the up-coming NomCom cycle.

Recommendation 1:

The publication of the ICANN budget overlaps with the most intense period of the NomCom cycle, which ends at the conclusion of the June ICANN meeting. Thus, the NomCom is not able to provide any specific budget guidance at this time for next year's NomCom cycle. I would recommend that the Board provide the current NomCom this opportunity well in advance of the next AGM meeting, when the new NomCom cycle begins.

Recommendation 2:

For the next budget cycle, I recommend that the annual process used by the Board to generate the NomCom budget, change to include soliciting input from the existing NomCom members, before the NomCom begins its spring ritual of evaluating candidates and prior to submitting the budget for public comment, in order to properly consider suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the NomCom process and systems.

Rationale:

The NomCom is an independent committee tasked with selecting eight members of the Board of Directors and other key positions within ICANN's structure as are set forth in the Bylaws. The members of the Nominating Committee are elected for one-year terms by their respective stakeholder groups, with the term commencing at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) for the current year and ending at the subsequent AGM for the following year.

The current NomCom has had vigorous discussions on potential process and system improvements that might justify increasing the budget line items for NomCom professional services and capital investments. I am sure this no different than any other year. However, due to the lack of institutional memory in the NomCom, there is no established knowledge transfer from one NomCom to the next, thereby inhibiting continuous process improvement.

As a result, the NomCom FY17 budget is virtually identical to the NomCom FY16 budget, aside from a small increase in the “Travel & Meetings” line item. There is no change for “Professional Services” from the previous cycle. There are zero dollars allocated for “Capital” improvements.

ICANN is missing the opportunity to engage the existing NomCom in preparing the budget for the new NomCom cycle. This would allow the existing NomCom to make the next NomCom more efficient and productive. Essentially, ICANN is placing every in-coming NomCom Board at an immediate disadvantage by not asking their predecessors for budget guidance for the upcoming NomCom cycle.

I understand that the NomCom has always had the option to request unforeseen expenses or capital investment throughout the year from the ICANN Board. In practice, such an approach discourages requests and is not optimal to allow for continuous improvement of the NomCom process.

I would recommend that ICANN’s annual planning process for the NomCom budget be changed to incorporate timely input and guidance from the then-existing NomCom members to help establish the appropriate budget for the subsequent NomCom cycle.

Respectfully Yours,

Tom Barrett
EnCirca, Inc