**Draft letter to David Olive/ SO&AC Community Leaders [ ] July 2020**

Dear David and SO & AC Chairs

**Next Steps in Assisting Community Work — Selection Process for Bylaws IRP Standing Panel**

I write to you on behalf of the IRP implementation Oversight Team (IRP-IOT), regarding the Bylaws-mandated selection process for the IRP Standing Panel. We are aware that David recently sought input from community leaders about how the community will exercise its role to identify the slate of panelists, and how best David and his team could assist. The IRP-IOT also understands that one suggestion is whether the community could exercise its role by leveraging an existing group, such as the IRP-IOT.

Under the ICANN Bylaws (s4.3(j)(ii)) ICANN, in consultation with the SOs and ACs, should initiate a four-step process to establish the Standing Panel. ICANN should solicit applications from well-qualified candidates (as it is now doing) . The SOs and ACs are responsible for nominating a slate of proposed panel members from these candidates (s4.3(j)(ii)(C)), who will then be appointed by the Board.

The Bylaws also specify the establishment of an IRP-IOT, and assign to it several responsibilities, including developing supplementary rules of procedure for the IRP and rules for the Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP).

The Bylaws do not allocate to the IRP-IOT the task of interviewing and selecting a proposed final slate of panellists to comprise the Standing Panel. All IRP-IOT members are committed to developing a strong and effective IRP. The IRP-IOT does not believe that, as a group, it is best placed to identify the proposed slate of panellists:

* members eof the BAMC’s call for volunteers[[1]](#footnote-1) believe finalizing a set of procedures to conduct IRP proceedings is
* .
* Not all SOs and ACs have members participating in the IRP-IOT.
* Whilst several IRP-IOT members have been involved in panelist selection for IRP or other arbitration procedures, reviewing applications and interviewing candidates, possibly working with external experts (as suggested by the community feedback[[2]](#footnote-3)) seems more akin to a recruitment role.

The IRP-IOT stands ready to assist in this process, and provides the following suggestions:

* Community feedback strongly supported a small, SO/AC-appointed committee to take on this responsibility.
* Individual IRP-IOT members may be well-qualified (including familiarity with Bylaws s4.3) and interested to participate as volunteers in this exercise.
* This is a specialist process. The NomCom has developed robust processes for working with external experts, screening and interviewing candidates, and maintaining applicant privacy and confidentiality. We do not suggest that the NomCom handle this process, but do suggest that any group appointed to identify the slate of panelists leverage the existing NomCom procedures.
* Community feedback strongly supported the use of external expertise. The experts who work with the NomCom might be well-placed to assist, and are already familiar with ICANN. The expertise of the existing IRP provider may also be beneficial.

Please do let us know if the IRP-IOT can assist further.

Yours sincerely

Susan Payne

IRP-IOT Chair

1. <https://community.icann.org/display/IRPIOTI/Independent+Review+Process+-+Implementation+Oversight+Team+%28IRP-IOT%29+Home?preview=/96211302/111390805/2019-06-26LeonSancheztoSOAC-Leaders-Repopulating-IOT-0001.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://community.icann.org/display/ESPFIRP/Relevant+Documents?preview=/95095469/126431359/CommunityFeedbackEstablishingStandingPanel_31March2020.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)