# ICANN
# NOMCOM LEADERSHIP 360º 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 360º EVALUATIONS REPORT
# FOR STÉPHANE VAN GELDER

The following is a Summary of a 360º Survey containing evaluation ratings for the current ICANN Nominating Committee Chair, Stéphane Van Gelder.  There were two parts to the evaluation process…
1.  A written 360º Survey/Evaluation.
2.  An telephone interview with participating evaluators/raters.

These Surveys/Evaluations were conducted during July and August, 2015.

Evaluators/Raters

Twenty-one evaluators were invited to participate in the 360º Survey (including the individual being evaluated)…
- Eighteen of the twenty-one invitees responded with a written 360º Survey.
- Three invitees did not participate in the 360º Survey process.
- One invitee did not complete the full Survey for Stéphane Van Gelder.
- Nine invitees did not participate in the telephone interview.
- A total of twelve invitees participated in all aspects of the 360º Survey process.

## 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 for the Chair

The pages that follow indicate the Written 360º Survey ratings and their explanations for the individual being rated:  the Chair of the NomCom, 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 360º 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 meetings),
   c. *Operating Style* ("how" he gets things done, such as accomplishing 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:  50.1 / 55**.  Responses were:  111 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 69 "B" (Agree) responses, 7 "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:  12 "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…

*Positive…*
Stéphane is consistently neutral.  He demonstrates the highest level of integrity and never gives the appearance of impropriety.  He never attempts to influence anyone regarding candidate selection or evaluation, always encouraging members to express and exchange their opinions, as well as to analyze relevant issues.  Stéphane kept the committee focused on the important matters and ensured that work was done properly.  He immediately stopped any comments or actions that were inconsistent with integrity.  He always acts with impartiality, never trying to influence discussions or outcomes.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #2 (Participates in an Open and Honest Manner): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 9 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 8 "B" (Agree) responses, 0 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of Explanations…

*Positive…*
Stéphane's working style is always transparent. He is honest in his comments and thinking – sometimes to a fault – and provides reasons for the decisions he has made. He always shares important information about matters, issues and decisions, and makes decisions in a consensual manner. Stéphane is respectful of other Committee members' comments and thinking.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #3 (Demonstrates Good Judgment): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 9 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 7 "B" (Agree) responses, 1 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of Explanations…

*Positive…*
Stéphane has facilitated the Committee's work with thoroughness and has proposed methods for it to effectively achieve its tasks. Decision making was by consensus. Solid experience was the basis for his decision making. On the whole, he has demonstrated good judgments and has not imposed his judgments about candidates on any Committee members.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
Occasionally Stéphane has shown a lack of good judgment – involving expediency over other options – but this has not been so frequent as to be disruptive. On occasion, he has been a bit too partial to arbitrary rules of process that were counterproductive. There were a few "judgment calls" around which a better choice could have been made – but these were rare and the issue was not really troublesome.

Question #4 (Effectively Uses Influence in an Appropriate Manner): **4.4** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 8 "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…

*Positive…*
Stéphane is very hands-off, never heavy-handed in his leadership style. He is nuanced and patient. He prefers to avoid any appearance of using *influence* regarding NomCom activities. He has used his influence on the NomCom process in a positive way, by accepting suggestions from the Chair-Elect and Associate Chair, as well as other Committee members. Stéphane always encourages consensus decision-making – however, he never hesitates to correct any drift in agenda or process, although through diplomatic means.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
On occasion an on certain issues – particularly early-on as Chair – he could have created an environment with more debate and consensus-driven decisions.

Question #5 (Is an Effective Leader): **4.7** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 12 "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…

*Positive…*
Stéphane is clearly an effective leader, evidenced by the fact that he kept the Committee on-schedule and on-target – which is no small accomplishment. He uses humor and a "light hand" to facilitate meetings, and this works quite well. Stéphane listens and then accepts suggestions and proposals from those involved in decision-making. He considered the Chair-Elect, Associate Chair and himself as a team, an approach to leadership which was quite effective. He ensured that all necessary steps were taken to arrive at conclusions. His leadership style of openness created much positive discussion among NomCom members.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
There were no comments or suggestions.

Question #6 (Is a Good Listener):  **4.4** out of a possible 5.0.  Responses were:  8 "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…

*Positive…*
Stéphane keeps his own thoughts and comments to a minimum, and encourages all participants to speak on each discussion topic. He listens to suggestions about process and documents them, but never imposes his opinions – he allows members to react, accept or reject suggestions.  He is a very patient listener to anyone who asks to speak.  He listens and is open to any suggestions about process improvement.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
Sometimes Stéphane multi-tasks instead of focusing on the people who are speaking to him and/or the Committee.  He is a good, but not an exceptional listener.

Question #7 (Treats Others with Respect):  **4.5** out of a possible 5.0.  Responses were:  9 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 8 "B" (Agree) responses, 0 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of Explanations…

*Positive…*
Stéphane is very patient and respectful with anyone who wishes to express themselves – and in the case of the leadership team, he delegates roles to them.  He is usually firm, yet respectful, and he uses a measured response to those who are displeased with a NomCom decision.  He is quite diplomatic – one could say he uses a firm hand inside a velvet glove.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
Occasionally, he has used a rather harsh – in fact biting – tone when addressing members.  Sometimes, he has adopted an unnecessarily patronizing attitude – as is used with children.

Question #8 (Takes Responsibility and is Accountable for Ensuring the Nominating Committee Meets Its Timelines):  **4.9** out of a possible 5.0.  Responses were:  15 "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…

*Positive…*
Stéphane has a relaxed style of management. Despite an increased workload of interviewing, he was able to maintain the required time lines in a cordial, respectful and responsible manner. He accepted his deadline responsibilities in a very serious way. Stéphane has considered meeting time lines as the most important of options. He made meeting time lines the primary focus for the committee.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
His insistence on meeting time lines as the most important issue has produced both positive and negative results.

Question #9 (Demonstrates Impartiality and Neutrality): **4.5** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 10 "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…

*Positive…*
Stéphane was very careful about never expressing a view about a candidate, region or background. There was never even a hint of his preference or view of any candidate. Stéphane even told the Committee about a relationship he has with a candidate.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
Stéphane should keep in mind that simply recusing himself from a decision or vote is not enough – he also should remove himself physically from such activities.

Question #10 (Demonstrates an Understanding of the Values a Nominating Committee Appointee Would Add to Each of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO): **4.6** out of a possible 5.0. Responses were: 11 "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…

*Positive…*

Stéphane is quite knowledgeable about all aspects and values of each position with which the NomCom is involved.  His energy contributed to receiving improved and specific criteria from several ICANN bodies/entities.  He organized and initiated several useful initiatives.  Stéphane's "insider" status at ICANN was helpful.  He convinced the NomCom that it is important to elect candidates who meet the needs of the Board.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*

Stéphane could have spent more time reviewing the values requested by each ICANN body prior to deliberating on an appointment.

Question #11 (Demonstrates an Understanding of the Criteria for Selection of Nominating Committee Appointees to Each of the ICANN Board, ALAC, GNSO and ccNSO):  **4.4** out of a possible 5.0.  Responses were:  8 "A" (Strongly Agree) responses, 7 "B" (Agree) responses, 2 "C" (Neutral) responses, 0 "D" (Disagree) responses and 0 "E" (Strongly Disagree) responses.

Summary of Explanations…

*Positive…*

Stéphane actively solicited criteria from participating organizations prior to selection discussions.  He ensured that appointee selection criteria was received and reviewed by all parties involved – according to what was required to support the Board and the ICANN mission.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*

Prior to votes, it would have been positive to remind NomCom members of the criteria received from ICANN organizations.

**TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESPONSES FOR
STÉPHANE VAN GELDER**

Individual comments included…

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

*Positive…*

Stéphane clearly is a consensus builder, ensuring that everyone has a "say" in deliberations, but he closes discussions when necessary to stay on agenda. Proposals become group decisions. He creates synergy within a group. He is able to realize the long-term effects of an idea or proposal and then he can coalesce a team around a decision. He finds compromise within a group. He has a gentle, yet energetic leadership style. Stéphane uses humor to make a point when leading a group or team. He is an excellent facilitator, frequently using humor to encourage others to contribute to a discussion. He shows a good blend of strategic (visionary, long term, etc.) and tactical (practical, drilling down on immediate issues and details) thinking. Stéphane wants everyone to participate in order to benefit from each contributor's skills and experience.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*

There were no comments or suggestions.

*Management Style (how he manages projects and issues):*

*Positive…*

Very agenda driven – announces shut-down time ("We'll take one more comment."). He both builds consensus and straddles the agenda fence well. Stéphane has a low-key, hands-off management style, and it works well. He is quite focused on detail, often drilling down into minutia, but at the same time staying with the agenda. He is very open and encourages new ideas and proposals. He recuses himself when necessary.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*

Sometimes it is unclear whether the source of advice and criteria is coming from the constituencies/bodies with which the NomCom is working.

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

*Positive…*

Qualities that Stéphane often demonstrates are friendliness, flexibility, graciousness, cautiousness and respectfulness of others. He is very structured and organized, and thus is able to bring things back into focus when they get off-track. Stéphane is very polite and compassionate of others. He multi-tasks well, a quality that has served him well. He is open and honest, always listening and watching reactions in the room. Stéphane is conscience of both the verbal and non-verbal environment around him.

He balances priorities nicely.  He's an extremely respectful, diplomatic man, yet he can be direct and concise with candidates that are not selected.

*Areas for Improvement/Development…*
Stéphane doesn't listen (or hear) enough.  He can be a bit intolerant of time wasters.  Agenda often trumps consensus – he needs to better balance these two issues.