LARS HOFFMANN:	Hello. Welcome, everybody, to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group meeting on Thursday, the 27th of August 2020 at 13:00 UTC.

I'm going to do a quick roll call, ask for the SOIs, take a look at the agenda, and then pass it on to our trusted chair, Tom. On the call today we have Tom, we have Remmy, we have Leah, we have Vanda who just joined the Zoom Room. We have—sorry, I need to go back to Dave who we have on the call, Cheryl and Tom. And then from Staff, we have Teresa, we have Pamela, we have Jia and Jennifer. And then we have Betsy, Yvette, Jean-Baptiste and myself, Lars.

Does anyone have any updates for their SOIs? It does not look that way. So we take a quick look at the agenda.

Okay. Good. We're going to talk about Recommendation 27, the issue of independent directors. So go back to the process diagram, which is 13. Then if we have time to quickly look at the possibility of a Standing Committee process diagram which would fall under Recommendation 24, the next meeting, Any Other Business. And with that, I believe I will pass it on to Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Lars. Welcome, everybody. You'll notice we did remove an item from the agenda today regarding the feedback from the GNSO, SO/AC chairs as we only received written response from IPC, and we already discussed that last week.

Regarding Recommendation 27: Independent Directors, we discussed last week rewording our basic response to this. So I actually took a shot at that that, I want to get everyone's feedback on. So let me just read it to you. It's number two here.

"During each NomCom appointment cycle, the NomCom shall recruit and nominate Board Directors to the ICANN Board who have no or very limited prior involvement with ICANN and who would have no or very limited chances of being appointed to the Board through any of the SO/AC-appointed seats. The goal of this stipulation is to appoint directors who bring an outside perspective to ICANN without predisposition towards any of ICANN's community groups."

"However, given the unpredictability of the candidate pool, the NomCom is allowed to make a single exception each year of a candidate not meeting this requirement."

So that's some proposed language, again taking a different approach from what was there previously. And obviously, there's two parts to this. The first paragraph makes it clear what the intent is of this recommendation. And again, the goal would be to have this part of the NomCom operating procedures so it's clearly communicated to all members of the NomCom and the ICANN community writ large. And of course, it drives not only the recruitment process but also the assessment and nomination process as well. But then given that we wanted to give ourselves a little bit of flexibility, there's that second paragraph. So looking for hands, responses, comments, suggestions. Vanda?

EN

VANDA SCARTEZINI: For me, it makes sense. It's flexible, it's is clear, and it's okay for me. I believe we found a very good sentence to explain our thoughts. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Leah?

LEAH SYMEKHER: I think it's a good way to summarize our thoughts and intentions, but I was just wondering when you say, "However, given the unpredictability," if there's any way in that particular section we could really make this as a last resort and not an immediate. This should be considered after everything else is exhausted. Yes, I guess that's what I mean. It should be just like a last resort if everything is exhausted. I think it needs to be very clear in that particular sentence. I don't think it is just stating that clearly enough or strong enough.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks, Leah. You'll note that every year there's either two, possibly three openings on the Board. So unlike the previous version which said at least one of those needs to be an unaffiliated director, this reverses that and says that one of those may be affiliated, basically. So it's certainly weighed much more heavily than previously towards the unaffiliated directors. But yeah, I take your point that we should make it clear that this is only under the extraordinary situation that they should even consider this. So again, to your point, I think the goal is every year

the NomCom should look for unaffiliated directors. Full stop. So perhaps some sort of mechanism needs to be triggered that requires an extra hurdle for them to say, "Look, guys, we can't fill all the seats without affiliated directors this year, and here's why."

Is that a new hand, Leah?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah, it is a new hand. I guess the tricky part here is that—I think it's good because it sets the expectations that if we have let's say 100 candidates, and out of that usually maybe half are for the Board seats, that there should be consideration in that pool for someone or candidates who would meet this category. So it's good. I guess it's good having it earlier enough so that it's understood by all NomCom members when they come to selecting the initial elimination processes because that's where the [inaudible] elimination occurs and does not allow that by the time you get to the last, the third step of the interviewing process, the pool already doesn't exist in terms of accommodating this. And I'm not saying they should be … So anyway, I think maybe it's good for it to be very clear enough in the beginning as it is so the members of NomCom are aware of the expectations that have been set by this, by what you're putting forth here.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Leah. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I understand what Leah is trying to say, but I do believe that in some way in these rules inside the NomCom, they need something saying that in such condition, they allow it. In some way, we need to put "allow it" because if it's not there, they are not allowed. So maybe if facing a problem, there is no way out. So I do believe that maybe continue this saying that "explain the reasons" in the report but "allow it" is necessary, in my opinion, to be inside the rules to allow them really, follow this path if it needs. But in my opinion, it must be there to allow them to do that. If it's not expressed, maybe we're going to face a very difficult situation in the future. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Amanda. I see Dave is providing support online as well. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. I actually think that this new language does the job pretty well as it as it is written. I, just for the record here, I suppose, would actually want to share with you that personally I would be okay if it didn't even say a single exception. I would actually okay saying, you know, given the unpredictability, or to recognize given the unpredictability of a candidate pool at any given year NomCom may need to make exceptions and put it a plural, giving a wiggle room, but rather than indicating a single exception each year, because I think there is a possibility that there might be the odd time when you might have to have the exception be to both out of two or two, even three out of three. But I think it does, the way it's written, [inaudible] on the desirability and preference for the unaffiliated to be appointed.

EN

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. So I'd like to offer an amendment and get your response to it. Let's say this stays as is. I'm wondering if what was missing here is the transparency to the community so that if the NomCom does decide to make an exception, how would the community know? And so maybe we need to include language to the effect that if the NomCom elects to make an exception to this, it must provide a rationale to why it made that exception. And then we can talk about whether or not that's prior, during, or after their announcement, but certainly require them to provide that level of transparency. Leah?

LEAH SYMEKHER: I think transparency is important but I'd like to maybe go back to what Cheryl had commented. And I think the way she put it was actually really something to consider, that instead of even the language, the way she phrased it was really, I think, helpful in the sense that it's to allow to make a single exception then gives the NomCom almost a green card to be able to—for as long as you have that single exception that every year, there could be a single exception or every time there is an issue or that extra effort or the pool is not good enough, whatever it is, it could be a reason that that green card could easily be used. So the language that I think Cheryl had proposed could help eliminate that. So I'm not sure if she can share that again with us but maybe, Tom, you have [views of everybody else,] but I thought that was really something for us to discuss here, what Cheryl just shared with us.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, that's my fault. I shouldn't have jumped ahead to my idea. So I do think Cheryl had a good point there as well. So given the unpredictability … maybe the first part of the sentence is fine. A NomCom is allowed to make an exception for candidates not meeting this requirement. Don't say it's a single exception but they're allowed to make exceptions for candidates not meeting this requirement. So we're not specifying a number. Perhaps that allows you to have more flexibility there. Does that cover what you're saying, Cheryl?

LEAH SYMEKHER: I don't think so. Maybe [inaudible] would make it better. It wasn't that light because that is not strong enough.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So as Cheryl said, it was recorded. We could let Staff wordsmith it for the next meeting.

Okay. So in terms of transparency, is it sufficient to simply say as part of their Annual Report they explain why they made the exception or should they have to indicate it or publicize it earlier? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. I'm all for transparency, don't get me wrong, but I don't believe we should be requiring detailed explanations of the choices made by any NomCom, in any NomCom year, to the community. I think the community will always bitch and moan usually out of a lack of understanding and a lack of access to all the information that the

Nominating Committee will know. I don't think we need to gild the lily. I just think that setting some very crisp—

TOM BARRETT: I think we lost you, Cheryl, but I think we got the gist of it. So Cheryl is saying she doesn't want to go into a lot of details on their decisions. Leah?

LEAH SYMEKHER: I think your question was the timing of being transparent about it. I think there's a report that comes out, an update to the community after every elimination process. I know that's usually very confidential because of the very sensitive time to share really any information. So probably, because your questions are about timing, in the end it would be the best thing, the best timing. But to Cheryl's point, it'll have to be very delicately shared because that's really then stepping into, I believe, the boundaries of that confidentiality aspect of the NomCom.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. So I'll ask the question a little differently to see if it has a different response. My thinking here is that these exceptions that might occur, they should not actually occur until the assessment phase. So I guess what we're saying, we don't want the NomCom to kick off at their November meeting and decide, "Okay, we're not going to limit our recruitment to unaffiliated directors this year," prior to seeing the candidate pool. So I guess that's the scenario we don't want to provide them the flexibility to do, so that the flexibility to not come into play

during the recruitment phase, necessarily. It comes into play during the assessment phase. But anyone disagree with that? Leah?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I think we're getting too much into the weeds.

TOM BARRETT: I'm sorry. I know Leah wants to talk as well. But it has to do with—if we're defining a process—and we're going to get into this I think on the next section here about some of the other bylaw issues—what is the absolute flexibility of the NomCom to make changes to that process without again being transparent to the community?

I'm sorry, Leah. Why don't you continue your thought?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah. So in terms of timing, again because this is what you're asking, initially before during the recruitment phase, that's definitely not the time to just—excluding or doing any kind of exclusions as such because we are we are an open recruitment, it's an open recruitment effort to fill the open seats. I see the only time it would happen in terms of even working towards the confidentiality obligations of the NomCom that would be at the end, after they have done the selection. It's difficult for me to see it happening during that or in the assessment phase, which would be good if you can but I'm not sure if that would be possible with just the expectation of the NomCom and respecting candidates' confidentiality in the whole process. So I think that will happen in the end from my experience. And I am open to any other viewpoints.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Leah. Cheryl? Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hopefully, you can hear me.

TOM BARRETT: You're breaking up on us, Cheryl.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah, we can't hear you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's rather unstable. Can you hear or not? Just read the [inaudible] minutiae. It's too limiting. Leave it as is. NomComs need to be, for example, able to reappoint all two or three Board directors, if it's absolutely the best thing for them to do. Wiggle room has to be there. I think this does force the preference—rightly so—to unaffiliateds. It allows the option.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. You do bring up an interesting point. This certainly wasn't aimed at reappointing. Obviously, by definition, a returning director might no longer be considered unaffiliated so I wonder—I don't know if we need to make that indication. Lars?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's exactly what this means if you push it that far. You would be forcing no returning.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. We could probably add a word to handle that case. But I'll give Lars a chance to talk, and then maybe we can talk about wordsmithing this some more.

LARS HOFFMANN: Exactly to that point—and I think it's very well pointed out by Cheryl. Implicitly, I had assumed that this applies only for first-time applicants. So if I'm an outsider, I've been nominated falling under this, and then I reapply, so the question is then surely that shouldn't limit me from reapplication. Am I still considered as one of the outsider slots? And if not, then does this only apply to people who've applied for the first time to NomCom? And then it has implications on the selection. To me, I would say, to make it the easiest is that if I'm an outsider the first time, I'm also considered under this, I'm also an outsider of subsequent times I apply for reselection. That would probably be the easiest. I'm not saying that that's what the group wants, but I think we actually have to spend some time on this. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Lars. Again, we can wordsmith this. I'll offer another amendment to the second paragraph here. And again, I was told I got it wrong the first time but I'll repeat what I said before. "However, given the unpredictability of the candidate pool, the NomCom is allowed to

make exceptions of candidates not meeting this requirement or candidates who are reapplying from the Board." So we could make that another exception that can be made as part of this requirement. So we can certainly wordsmith that some more. But I think certainly if the initial appointment was made right, then they remain an unaffiliated director even when they reapply. So we can circulate something in the upcoming week about that and get some more comments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: Shall we move on? So this is something we want to add to the NomCom operating procedures. And then the question we have is, how do we make that stick and not being omitted from the next year Operating Procedure manual because the NomCom has that flexibility? And so that comes in in two places—one in the ICANN Bylaws and the other one is a preamble, the operating procedures themselves. Jean-Baptiste and Lars, I know you have that question pending within ICANN Legal about two things. One is, should we be changing the bylaws? And secondly, how do we make it stick within the operating procedure? Right? I'm looking to Lars or Jean-Baptiste on that.

LARS HOFFMANN: Yeah, that's right, Tom. And we are in communication and we probably should have an answer back by next week.

TOM BARRETT:	Okay. Thanks. If we could just bring up the operating procedures real quick, because I suspect it'll be obvious where this becomes a problem. And this is the 2020 NomCom Operating Procedures but if you go back to 2004, the same paragraph was there then. So this has obviously been very consistent. Section 1, modifications to these procedures. "The NomCom reserves the right to modify them in the course of its work in order to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in fulfilling its responsibilities. If the NomCom concludes that modification of these procedures is necessary, the NomCom will post the changes on the NomCom web page."

This is obviously something we want to change, certainly if not in the bylaws, in these procedures. As you can see here, there's nothing on this year's NomCom page or previous ones that describes, for example, a redline to their operating procedures. So that sort of transparency is lost in the current method. So I think we're saying, at a minimum, this should be a redline published every year, not just a commentary. And some of those, of course, are immutable. Some of them might involve public comment, etc. So that is what is being proposed as part of the Standing Committee's charter, is to oversee that process. And the question is whether or not that requires a bylaw change to enact that process, first of all, and secondly, how do we designate what parts of these procedures that the NomCom cannot change?

So I think that probably is an exercise that we should go through at some point, is review these operating procedures and maybe come up with that picket fence we talked about last week, where clearly there should be some areas that the NomCom cannot change. So we're going to rely on Legal on advice for this, I guess, on both of those questions.

Okay. Any comments or questions on this? We also saw some changes to these operating procedures. I know this is the standard table of contents. Clearly, changing the number section 1 modification, we also should probably include a section to this about the role of a Standing Committee vis-à-vis the NomCom. That probably should be a standard part of the operating procedures as well.

Okay. Seeing no other comments or questions, I guess we'll move on to the next agenda item. So the process diagram for Recommendation 13, if we could bring that up. So this process diagram is, in a way, the graphical or high-level summary of the operating procedures. Yes. So it could be embedded into the operating procedures or it could be a standalone document. So do we want to walk through this again? We have some edits in yellow.

So at a high level, the NomCom is seated. So the goal here is to start to set months of the year to this. We have the NomCom is seated, we have the Leadership is seated, the establishment of subcommittees, and the review of operating procedures in column zero. Column one is publicize any material deviations in the NomCom. And again, there'd be a deadline for that.

Two, confirm the candidate outreach events, basically their marketing plan for that particular year, publish job descriptions for the openings, adopt operating procedures, perform outreach, announcement of application period. So there's a lot going on in there.

Three, set soft dive the candidates, multiple interactions, invite consultant to report back on their high-level assessment of the

candidates. Four, deep dive the candidates. Five, final interviews. Six, make a final selection. Then we have eight, inform the candidates. Nine, announce final selection. We have candidate surveys and reporting and debrief with Standing Committee.

So from a high level, does everyone feel like this captures the key points? Cheryl says, "I would leave this as a typical or expected flowchart." Again, there's flexibility to change it. There certainly needs to be some sort of mechanism for the NomCom to let people know they're changing from this. The whole idea of having this obviously was to ensure consistency. So if the NomCom decides they want to not follow this flow, they need to communicate that somehow in a timely matter.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think this does the job enough. I don't think we need to go into any more detail.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. All right, so should we start to put this on a calendar, so to speak, and indicate the months of the year this happens?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no. Don't put it to fixed months. This flow will do. But, you know, shit happens. Look at 2020. What do we do? Throw our hands in the air and go, "Woe is me. NomCom 2020 has failed because it hasn't met its date by August 22"? Just leave it as a flow and let the

EN

Nominating Committee each year template to this as best that they can. If they do it a month early or a month later, the world doesn't end.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Lars?

LARS HOFFMANN: Yeah, just a suggestion. So I agree that exact timings are probably not appropriate. Also, Tom, predictability and also, though, I think maybe the overarching issue was actually I think transparency, right? So just to know what is happening, kind of when I think is more sequenced than exact date. But I think we can do other overlays here, for example, right, so I think adding, for example, ICANN meetings, where they roughly fall on this. Obviously, the Policy Forum will not be held before the soft dives, right? So to kind of give people a general idea of, when does the final announcement selection take place—after the Policy Forum, one assumes—I think might be helpful.

There may be something along those lines of, the reporting and debrief with a Standing Committee. I can see a situation where, for example, we could add a "no later than" date. But I think that's just to make sure that we have an expectation, we can always say "usually no later than". But I think actually those dates, even this debriefing, can also be overlaid. Once we have a flowchart in place that looks somewhat pretty, I think overlaying it with timing is the least of our worries. All that to say I think ICANN meeting at this stage is all that's required, and I'll stop rambling. Thank you.

EN

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Lars. I do think we need to depict this more of a flow than just a bunch of columns in a spreadsheet. So we need to show obviously there's potential overlap between some of these things but there's also prerequisites.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Right. I mean, I call this, technically, making it look pretty. So we will talk to comms and see what they can suggest doing with this. Obviously, I don't think anyone's suggesting this in itself is the final outcome and product of the recommendation. But I think the information that's contained in here I think is sufficient.

TOM BARRETT:

So I don't think there's any disagreement that we have a drop-dead date for—or I'm not sure there is a drop-dead date, but there are dates for announcing final selection. But there are also some pretty hard deadlines for other stuff like the new NomCom being seated, Leadership being seated, that have not been consistent in the past. So I think there are some earlier dates that are—and we want to make sure we make visible to the community as well. As we said earlier, we want to make sure Leadership is appointed earlier than typical or it has been happening in the past, so that needs to come out here in the process flow.

Okay, so as a next step then to try to present this as an infographic. Is that what you're thinking, Lars? I'll take that as a yes. Are there any other …

So these other rows down here in terms of, the Standing Committee will have some things that they work on, the appointing bodies, receiving bodies, ICANN Org. Do we need any of this stuff? Is there information in here that we want to publicize at a different level? Can you scroll down a little bit so we can see the other rows? There you go.

So, for example, the yellow here is new under ICANN Org. We have a marketing plan obviously in column B. Column C, NomCom Staff will notify all community groups after the last official day of the Community Forum. The ICANN public meeting, March with an early June deadline going forward. That's for eligibility of incoming NomCom members. And then of course towards the end, you see candidate survey for all applicants. So there is some process here in terms of how the SO/ACs interact with the NomCom. So Cheryl wants to wait to see what the graphic looks like. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. Hopefully, my Internet will stay stable for 30 seconds. I think these additional lines, the horizontal bands, can find their way into a flowchart in a [inaudible] form in an appropriate way. But again, I would do it more in a sequence and not tied to a particular meeting, even, of ICANN. It is perfectly possible and it could be perfectly reasonable for the NomCom process to run utterly out of sync of ICANN [inaudible] still have to go on. You know what I mean? So do it more by

"no later than" dates and keep away from a June or July or a meeting A, B, or C, or whatever. It's purely coincidence and convenience that anything ever happens at an ICANN meeting. And we certainly have had NomComs in the past that have operated perfectly successfully without ever having it happen that they go to an ICANN meeting at all, and that's okay. So I think it's the sequencing and the publicity that is important here. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. I think that's a good point. These other rows perhaps, if you could do a graphic for that. That first row, that these are really inputs to different things happening on that first row. Perhaps we can somehow show them as inputs or prerequisites. I assume there'll still be commentary describing this process diagram that maybe can describe all that.

                     Cheryl, is that new? Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just trying to type. I was just typing yes—

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So we're getting agreement in the chat from Leah, Vanda, and Dave that these can be inputs to that process. All right. I think we lost Cheryl. The question is—certainly the operating procedures presumably will have a section that describes all this activity. We'll want to do a sanity check to make sure that the operating manual isn't silent on

some of this stuff. All right, Cheryl, you're not lost. Any other comments, questions? Shall we go on to the next agenda item?

This is a process diagram for the Standing Committee. There's a link here. Again, we haven't spent too much time talking about this but I do think it needs to be more comprehensive than probably what we've had before. Is there anything in this yet? Here we go. All right.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom, it's Jean-Baptiste. Just to help on that, what we did is that we tried to gather all the different tests that belong to the same committee just to help keep the discussion on when and where in the process do these fall. And we have listed them here. Of course, if there any qualities here that are not relevant or are missing, we'd be happy to change that.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. If we can just scroll up a little bit. So we have the NomCom Leadership, obviously talking about "Oversee continuous improvement and one-time deviations to NomCom operating procedures." So this almost implies that there's certainly a lot of interaction if there's any changes, any redline document to the operating procedures being suggested by the NomCom Leadership and [whether or not] those merit a public comment period. That's something that needs to—probably should describe that little process for that.

The next bullet talks about communicating the changes on the procedures via online dashboards and webinars. So that's the upfront process. We have review published recommendations in each

NomCom's annual report, coordinate the assessment of those recommendations with an upcoming NomCom Leadership. Maintain the evaluation toolkit used by the NomCom, capture interview questions asked by the NomCom, and seek feedback for the NomCom of usefulness of questions. I think that's probably just one example of doing continuous improvement and building institutional memory that the Standing Committee would need to be involved in. ICANN Board, again, coordinate with the job descriptions, coordinate with getting feedback from the Board or assessing the NomCom's performance. Engage with the Board of the optimum timing for the annual appointment of NomCom Leadership.

I think we want to add another bullet here. Coordinate with the ICANN Board on the Board's performance or at least on the performance of the returning of the NomCom appointees to the Board in the event that they decided to reapply. Maybe that's what was meant by 30 but I think we need both. So coordinate with Board on the performance of a reapplying NomCom appointee.

The other issue that came up in the past year or two has to do with— actually, we've run into it as well in terms of budget requests. Who do we coordinate or send those budget requests to? As you know, we tried to request budget for training. And we were said we're not the right people to make that request of. So apparently, we need to go back to the OEC or BGC to ask for extraordinary budget requests. Presumably, that would be part of our interaction with the ICANN Board as well. Cheryl?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Who's the "we" in what you're saying?

TOM BARRETT: The Standing Committee.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. The Standing Committee's budget would become part of an annual fixed budget and go through the normal budgetary processes. It wouldn't be [requiring] exceptions year in year out.

TOM BARRETT: So there was apparently more recently an issue with NomCom where they—it was a lot of back and forth in terms of a budget request they made and who they had to turn to. So there clearly was a breakdown this past year. I don't have any more details of that. The NomCom was looking for funding and I think actually went to the Board Committee, and they were told, "Go talk to ICANN Org." There's certainly some sort of broken process today. And when the ICANN needs funding, it's not clear about how that process works. Vanda? Or perhaps I just need more help. Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. I believe the problem is always—and we have discussed this—that the scheduling for asking for budget is completely out of the time for the new NomCom. For instance, it is running [inaudible] the next budget and the next NomCom is not sitting. That is the problem that we discuss here, that we should put in the hands of a Standing

Committee to deal with that, to guarantee for the next NomCom the budget for majority of the necessities they will have, like training and traveling and blah, blah, blah. So all those, we decide some months ago that we should put in the hands of a Standing Committee because there will be no share for the next NomCom when this application for asking for budget will be set in June of each year. That is my point. I believe that is in the hands of the Standing Committee to do that.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. That's indicated on line 34, where the Standing Committee would interact with ICANN Org for the annual budget process. What I think has surfaced more recently, both for our efforts as well as for the sitting NomCom, is how do they make budget requests that are not part of the annual budgeting cycle. That was not well understood process for us or for the other ICANN. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you're talking about—

TOM BARRETT: Sorry, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're talking about exceptional circumstances. I mean, the fact that we exist is exceptional. And in fact, [inaudible]. Do you hear me or what?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. You're breaking up a bit, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. If there is an extraordinary or exceptional requirement for additional funding, if it can't be predicted in putting into a standard budget process … There's not much I can do about it. The only option is if I just talk [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We're talking about you have a reserve?

TOM BARRETT: Yes. So if there's an unanticipated budget request, who handles that? Let's say the NomCom Leadership says, "We did not anticipate this. We need this budget request," they obviously are not going to go through ICANN Org for that. I believe they have to have a Board-approved expenditure as opposed to ICANN Org-approved expenditure.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I still believe that in that case, it should be in the Standing Committee's hands to deal with that. Because put the share of NomCom out of the task in the middle of the period to look after more money and discuss with A, B, C, and D to find something I believe is waste of their time. It's more important since it was the Standing Committee that make the project to have enough money, and if this money is not real enough for some reason, it should be Standing Committee to go after the money to

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. I'd like to suggest we add—we have a blank line 27 here under NomCom Leadership—and that is to assist NomCom Leadership with extraordinary budget requests. So we'll just leave it wide open.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Wide open might work, just.

TOM BARRETT: All right, so scrolling down a bit. We've got two more minutes. We'll just scroll through the rest of this list. We have things with ICANN Org. Obviously bodies that appoint members to NomCom. Again, these are all things for the Standing Committee to interact with the bodies for revisions to their job descriptions, provide any support where requested to help ensure members are selected per their internal timeline. So it's interesting we have, in our stakeholder group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, the appointed NomCom member needs to resign—this is the end of August—and the NomCom is still in their annual cycle. So the stakeholder group's scrambling to find out if a replacement makes sense going into September.

                        Scroll down a bit more. I'll spend one more minute for the rest of this. So again, bodies that appoint members to the NomCom, candidates applying for NomCom, external consultants to the NomCom. All this I guess should be, again there shouldn't be anything in here that is not

really part of the operating procedures. Otherwise, perhaps they need to be expanded to some degree. I think we have a great list here. We just have to make it some sort of more readable form. Any thoughts or comments before we move on?

All right, shall we go on to Any Other Business and Next Meeting? Next meeting is September 2, 19:00 UTC. Is there any other business? So today is—Lars, this is I believe your last official—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Lars, for being with us.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, Lars. [Have success.]

LEAH SYMEKHER: And all the best in your next role.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll trip over him. We'll find him in the corridors if we ever get to corridors again.

LARS HOFFMANN: That's right. You're not rid of me yet.

EN

LEAH SYMEKHER: It's been awesome working with you. Really, you've done a wonderful job. So really appreciate all your efforts.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you. Thank you, Leah. Thank you, everyone. It's been a pleasure working with you. I really have to say it's new adventures, but I'm very sad to see this work no longer be on my calendar. I'll keep an eye on you. Don't do anything I wouldn't do. I'll see you, as Cheryl said, in the corridors. Thanks a lot, everyone. It's been a pleasure.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thank you, Lars. Thanks, everybody. We'll talk to you next week.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. See you there.

TOM BARRETT: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]