

Statement from Stéphane Van Gelder, Chair Elect, 2014 NomCom

I am delighted to be able to share the results of the 360 review that was carried out by an independent contractor after the 50th ICANN meeting.

Since 2013, the NomCom has worked hard to provide the community with more information on its processes whilst always adhering to its sacrosanct rule of protecting the confidentiality of candidate data.

Through initiatives such as report cards and open meetings, as NomCom members have provided their respective communities with more regular and in-depth updates, the committee has reduced the "black box" effect that it had previously been tagged with.

At the same time, it has increased its collegiality and effectiveness. By all accounts, the 2013 and 2014 NomComs have ranked amongst the most respectful and productive working environments this committee has ever known.

I am fully committed to this drive towards a more efficient NomCom process and as part of that, feel it is important for the community to have access to the review of the committee's leadership.

Being accountable to the community we serve is paramount. The NomCom must continue to improve in these areas and I hope to be able to carry on contributing to this effort in future.

Stéphane Van Gelder

**ICANN
NOMCOM LEADERSHIP 360° EVALUATIONS REPORT
FOR STÉPHANE VAN GELDER**

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 STÉPHANE VAN GELDER

The following is a Summary of a 360° Survey containing evaluation ratings for the current ICANN Nominating Committee Chair-Elect, Stéphane Van Gelder. 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-Elect

The pages that follow indicate the Written 360° Survey ratings and their explanations for the individuals being rated: the Chair-Elect, Stéphane Van Gelder.

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 and 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 Stéphane Van Gelder.”
2. “As viewed and perceived from your NomCom experience, please describe Stéphane Van Gelder’s...

- a. *Leadership Style* (how he leads other people and teams),
- b. *Management Style* (how he manages projects and issues),
- c. *Operating Style* (how he 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 STÉPHANE VAN GELDER

Average Overall Rating: 49.7 / 55. Responses were: 93 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 64 “B” (Agree) responses, 8 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Question #1 (Demonstrates Integrity): **4.7** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 10 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 5 “B” (Agree) responses, 0 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

Stéphane’s “Self” explanation/commentary:

He sees his role on the NomCom as only serving ICANN and its community – no other interests.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Stéphane participated in all discussions and made certain that all issues involved were clarified through examples drawn from previous year experiences, thus allowing members to decide effectively. All of his behavior indicates high integrity. He has no difficulty in speaking up if he feels an issue is not being considered or implemented with integrity. What Stéphane says he’ll do, he does. He has his own high, integrity-based principles and values. He makes sure everyone maintains their roles and accomplishes their tasks. He is plain and transparent, always focusing on the right side of any point or issue.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #2 (Participates in an Open and Honest Manner): **4.7** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 10 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 5 “B”

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

Summary of explanations...

Stéphane’s “Self” explanation/commentary:

He sees himself as always being open, but always trying to say things the way he sees them.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Stéphane always speaks up or writes explanations of his views. He has shown that an open mind is the way to address any issue. He makes clear statements about his thoughts. Stéphane is very open and straight-forward. He speaks frankly and openly, and is quite honest with his colleagues.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #3 (Demonstrates Good Judgment): **4.3** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 6 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 8 “B” (Agree) responses, 1 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

Stéphane’s “Self” explanation/commentary:

This question is difficult to answer, since judgment and leadership are not active for the Chair-Elect.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Stéphane would always take into account other members’ views before making a decision. The judgments made by Stéphane about process (the area in which he was most active) were accurate and useful. On the whole, he demonstrates good judgment. There were rare occasions during which Stéphane could demonstrate good judgment, but on those few occasions, he did so nicely. In general, he demonstrated good and clear judgment in his opinions regarding most matters. Absolutely, he demonstrates excellent judgment.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

Stephane sometimes makes snap judgments (“shoots from the hip”), rather than giving more thought to matters.

Question #4 (Effectively Uses Influence in an Appropriate Manner): **4.3** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 6 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 8 “B” (Agree) responses, 1 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

Stéphane’s “Self” explanation/commentary:

Although the role of the Chair-Elect is not one for influencing the committed in any way, behind the scenes the Chair-Elect can work with the Chair and the Associate Chair to produce results. He attempted, in this way, to use his influence.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Stéphane would discuss issues, listen to members and use his influence when necessary to move issues forward. In most instances, he used his influence appropriately.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There was an instance in which the Chair-Elect challenged the Chair’s decision on a matter. It is unclear whether his challenge recommendation was approved by the whole committee. On one or two occasions, he used his strong position to influence weaker members and bring them to his decision.

Question #5 (Is an Effective Leader): **4.1** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 4 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 9 “B” (Agree) responses, 2 “C” (Neutral) responses, “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

Stéphane’s “Self” explanation/commentary:

This is not the Chair-Elect’s job. It is the role of the Chair.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Due to his role as Chair-Elect, Stéphane did not take an active leadership role, except when the Chair was unavailable – in those instances, he appeared to lead well. He knows how to make

people listen to him. He is an effective leader who, as the Chair, will involve every member in the decision making process. Stéphane likes to manage things and people – he is a leader by nature. When he talked about next year’s NomCom, he demonstrated good leadership by capturing the full attention of the group and managing their exchange of ideas – even when everyone wanted to leave to catch their flights. Stéphane is strong, clear, accurate, participatory and very well organized. He effectively assumed the Chair’s role when needed.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #6 (Is a Good Listener): **4.6** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 9 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 6 “B” (Agree) responses, 0 “C” (Neutral) responses, 0 “D” (Disagree) responses and 0 “E” (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of explanations...

Stéphane’s “Self” explanation/commentary:

He was very careful this past year to listen, rather than to impose his views – which is the proper role of the Chair-Elect.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

Stéphane re-stated issues raised by members when needed. He is a good listener – he takes the time to listen to and understand every member’s views prior to moving forward on issues. He is focused on what the other person is saying – from beginning to end – before he responds. Stéphane understood his role as one to listen, in a calm and attentive way. Indeed, he listens carefully, especially when it involves ideas that have not been tried previously. He looks for innovative approaches. He asks questions and is curious about what people on the committee think.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #7 (Treats Others with Respect): **4.6** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 9 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 6 “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...

Stéphane is most courteous with everyone. He respects every person and ensures that everyone is treated equally. He treats everyone with respect and cordiality. He both treats everyone with respect and he makes certain everyone is heard.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #8 (Takes Responsibility and is Accountable for Ensuring the Nominating Committee Meets Its Timelines): **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...

Stéphane’s “Self” explanation/commentary:

In support of the Chair, he ensured timelines were met.

Others’ explanations:

Positive...

It’s hard to know what influence the Chair-Elect had on meeting timelines, or if there was any. Stéphane worked closely with the Chair to achieve NomCom objectives in a timely way. Given the strong personality of the Chair, he may have found it difficult to effectively participate in the planning and execution of NomCom activities, but he did so. During debates, he positioned himself in a way to follow deadlines and to help convince others to do the same.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #9 (Demonstrates Impartiality and Neutrality): **4.6** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 10 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 4 “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...

Stéphane treated everyone equally, ensuring every member’s view was respected. He showed an inclusive attitude toward all candidates. This is clearly one of Stéphane’s strong suits. There was only one occasion in which he “crossed the line”, but he apologized for that, which nullified the situation. He clearly demonstrates both impartiality and neutrality.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #10 (Demonstrates an Understanding of the Values a Nominating Committee Appointee Would Add to Each of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 9 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 5 “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...

Stéphane has a great deal of experience, and he understands the values that are being sought in each selected NomCom appointee. He has strong knowledge of GNSO, ccNSO and the Board, due to his previous roles as Chair of GNSO. Regarding ALAC, Stéphane realized his lack of knowledge, so he learned about it, and now has a deeper understanding of the demands within this important element of ICANN.

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): **4.7** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 11 “A” (Strongly Agree) responses, 4 “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.

Others' explanations:

Positive...

Stéphane was able to describe and distinguish between various appointee roles. He always participated in discussions for the selection criteria. Stéphane delves deeply into matters for which he is responsible. He came to the Chair-Elect position with a full understanding of the role, as well as the NomCom process and its limits.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

There were not comments or suggestions.

General Comments...

Since the main role of the Chair-Elect is to prepare for his/her turn as Chair in the following year, to assist the current Chair and to step in if necessary, in the future, it might be advisable to create a slightly different set of 360° Survey questions for the Chair and the Chair-Elect.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESPONSES FOR STÉPHANE VAN GELDER

Individual comments included...

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

Positive...

Stéphane is very respectful of everyone and the NomCom's diversity. He involves everyone, but does not impose his ideas or views on others. He is good at resolving conflicts – in part, because of his listening skills and thus his ability to understand both sides of the conflict, thus getting to consensus/agreement. He explains goals and then discusses how to achieve them. He is not shy (in fact he is quite direct in communicating), he delegates well, he sets goals and works hard to achieve them, he embraces new ways of doing things, he is calm and thoughtful in his deliberations and he handles pressure well – thus he will provide excellent leadership to the position of Chair. His listening skills are superb, which when coupled with his energy, his strong but flexible personality and his

ability to focus on goals and objectives, will make him an excellent leader as Chair. He is a visionary for future programs and building a better NomCom. Stéphane is confident and a good listener, thus he is a good bridge builder and relationship builder. He is a good meeting facilitator, who builds consensus, handles conflict well and is open to process changes.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

Stéphane has a “rah-rah” leadership style, which does not always seem to be mature.

Management Style (how he manages projects and issues):

Positive...

Stéphane makes everyone feel important. He is a good listener and he keeps everything focused. He manages by consensus and keeps all members informed. Stéphane is very detail oriented, always crossing the “t’s” and dotting the “i’s”. He does not play games or engage in drama in business or in relationships. He keeps meetings and processes on schedule.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

Stéphane could be more transparent and open, but when in the role of Chair, he may further develop these characteristics.

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

Positive...

Stéphane has a high level of energy. He accepts feedback readily. He has a strong personality, but he is very flexible. Stéphane is an excellent communicator. He is very organized and is committed to meeting goals and schedules. He is enthusiastic and shows a take-charge style of operating. Stéphane can work very well behind the scenes and in many different roles – he can almost be called a chameleon. He is a very polite and pleasant fellow, who focuses on how ICANN can improve. His delegation and organization skills are excellent, and he facilitates meetings by bringing others into the discussion, offering feedback and sticking to agendas and schedules. He is a “comfortable” colleague, and not at all bossy. Stéphane is curious about things, often drilling down to get all the pertinent facts. He has used this year as an excellent opportunity to learn, and will do well as the NomCom Chair this coming year.

Areas for Improvement/Development...

Stéphane does not necessarily embrace change.

Other Comments...

There should be a better definition regarding who the NomCom should be recruiting. There should be more frequent interface between the Chair and the Chair-Elect, and the various NomCom sub-groups and committees. Timetables in meetings must be kept on schedule. The NomCom should not be expanded much beyond its current size, since if it becomes larger (with more members), it likely will become unwieldy.