

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hello and welcome, everybody, to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group meeting on Thursday, the 1st of October, 2020 at 19:00 UTC. As part of today's agenda, I will do a quick roll call and ask all of you whether you have any updates to your statement of interest.

So, as part of the roll call, today in the room, we have Tom Barrett, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Vanda Scartezini, Leah Symekher. And from ICANN Org, we have Yvette Guigneaux, Pamela Smith, Betsy Andrews, Chantelle Doerksen, Jennifer Bryce, and myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez. We also have apologies from Nadira Al-Araj. Are there any updates to your statements of interest, please? All right. I'll pass the microphone to Tom to go through the agenda. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. As you recall, there was some homework this past week, to take a look at the new draft that I'd sent out regarding how we respond to the SO/ACs regarding the rebalancing, then also the Standing Committee charter.

So, if we could bring up the response and I'll give you my rationale on why I changed the approach here. So, we have ... Obviously, as part of proposing the Bylaw changes to the OEC, we need to give them our rationale for the proposed change. And obviously, we'll give them some history as well, in terms of how we reached our current point. But I thought our response back to the SO/ACs could be a bit more direct and we didn't really need to give them the history of all the various phases of the review that we've gone through so far.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

And so, we've obviously taken a very different approach with this recommendation. We're not actually rebalancing anything. And so, I think we have to make sure that's very clear so that people don't keep raising issues, in terms of how they think the rebalancing should happen. So again, we're not ... We need to be very explicit that our approach here, at least at this point in time, is not to do any rebalancing but do an incremental change to the Bylaws that facilitates a later exercise for rebalancing.

And so, opening paragraph. And this, basically the same language would be repeated for all the SO/ACs. I only edited the IPC response. But I assume we would just cut and paste this for the others. So, I'd love to get your feedback on this. I'll walk through it real quick, if you haven't had a chance to see it.

First paragraph simply thanks the IPC and their response. Second paragraph, again, acknowledges some of the sensitivities that they are bringing up about rebalancing and basically saying it's precisely because of these challenges that the working group is proposing an incremental approach towards addressing this recommendation. And the proposed Bylaw revision will not actually result in any immediate change to the current composition.

So, I think we need to keep hammering that home, since most of the objections have to do with, "We don't like the potential outcome of rebalancing," or, "It's too complicated," blah, blah, blah. So, this is simply an incremental approach. It's in the spirit of continuous improvement. And we're not trying to solve the problem in one big step.

---

So, another benefit ... And I'd like to get your feedback on this as well. So, "One benefit of the proposed Bylaw change is to provide consistency and alignment with the related Bylaw for ALAC NomCom appointees, which are already silent in how the process that ALAC elects to use to allocate its NomCom appointees." That needs a little work. In effect, the GNSO is being afforded the same flexibility in deciding how to allocate its NomCom appointees, even if it decides to maintain the status quo for now.

Further notes that the [inaudible] of the GNSO charter [inaudible] potential evolution [inaudible] the GNSO to accommodate expansion in various forms, including stakeholder groups and constituencies. If we can scroll down a bit.

So, "The approach of conducting a holistic review or comprehensive assessment of representation within the ICANN community was considered by the working group during its feasibility and implementation phases for this recommendation. However, the drawback of a comprehensive assessment is that such an effort could take several years and could well be obsolete before its completion.

"This is especially true of the GNSO, whose structure has already changed since its inception and is likely to continue to evolve during any such assessment. In the spirit of ICANN's new continuous improvement philosophy, the suggested Bylaw change provides the GNSO, as well as the overall ICANN community, optimal flexibility for any number of approaches used in subsequent rebalancing discussions, both within and external to the GNSO, including maintaining the status quo." And

---

then, there's a final sentence down below, just saying happy to follow up some more, if you're interested.

So, in the same context, I also would note that the CSG, of which the IPC and BC are part of, have requested a meeting during the virtual ICANN meeting coming up. So, I'm sure this will be a topic of discussion as well. So, looking for hands or comments. Everyone okay with this type of approach? It still needs a little work, clearly. But I'm wondering if this approach is sufficient. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Tom. It's certainly sufficient for me, subject to some minor toilette. I'm perfectly happy with this approach. I was actually going to say ... And I'm not, actually, fully tongue-in-cheek here, [I'll accentuate]. Maybe, if we could get this letter out as soon as possible and copy it to the rest of the leadership within the GSNO, I don't have to waste my time meeting with them at the upcoming meeting, when I'm fully booked anyway. And I would think last thing we need to do is verbalize exactly what a perfectly good decision is articulated here, again, with yet another group.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. And Leah ... I can see Leah's saying it's sufficient for her. So, one of the things we could do with that is we could make this a letter sent to all the SO/ACs within the GNSO, in terms of acknowledging who we got responses back from and here's our next steps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And this is it. This is what we're doing.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I keep saying it's not a negotiation. And they keep trying to make it negotiation.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Okay. So, yeah. So, let me ... I'll do another iteration of that towards ... And perhaps we can ... We'll plan to send it out to everybody and not just the SO/ACs that responded. I think that's a good approach. All right. Any other thoughts or comments? We'll iterate ... I'll do another version of this over the weekend, and send it out, and see if we can't get this out sooner rather than later. All right. Why don't we go on to the next agenda item?

So, the NomCom Standing Committee. Your other homework item was to take a look at that spreadsheet, to see if there was anything missing. I don't see any other comments from anyone, other than myself. I think I noted that there was a section missing. But given that there's no feedback or new comments on that spreadsheet, I suggest we go straight to the charter itself, which I also have made some edits to. Basically, the spreadsheet was an input into how to structure the

---

charter. So, if we can bring up the charter, we can start to walk [through that] and see if this approach makes sense to everybody.

There we go. All right. So, a new acronym for you, NCSC, standing for the NomCom Standing Committee. We'll have to, I guess, ask the ICANN lords to bless that new acronym. So, we have background about why the Standing Committee was formed. "The IE recommended a Standing Committee be formed to suggest and insist in implementing changes to NomCom process. Since the NomCom itself operates on a tight timeline, it needs to focus on its recruiting and evaluation activities." We'll probably wordsmith that a little bit to throw in some data—something about ... Okay. Well, the next section talks about continuous improvement as well.

So, moving down to the purpose, "The Standing Committee's purpose is to oversee continuous improvement to the NomCom operating procedures and assure transparency and accountability to the overall ICANN [inaudible], including provide continuity across annual NomCom cycles, build the institutional memory of the NomCom, help coordinate non-confidential communications between the NomCom and external bodies." The word "external" probably needs to be wordsmithed. Instead of "external," just say "other bodies" so people aren't confused if that's internal or external to ICANN.

"The Standing Committee will develop goals and generate reports of its continuous improvement program, consistent with the approach recommended by the ATRT3 report." By the way, there's a footnote above for continuous improvement, which is just more of a 1980s-style definition of continuous improvement. And has the ATRT3 actually

---

defined “continuous improvement,” Cheryl? Or is it still to be determined?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, no. We didn’t define it. We gave some examples of good and best practices.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So, maybe we just.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that [inaudible] the reference points that [inaudible] ICANN will use.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So, I took a shot at a definition. Maybe if you can just scroll down to the footnote real quick. So, this can be simplified, obviously. “Continuous improvement, often known as Kaizen, is essentially a small, step-by-step, incremental improvement strategy. It is based on a belief that continual improvement can be brought about by a never-ending series of small changes.” That’s it. So, I don’t know if ICANN’s going to come up with something different but that’s the generic definition of continuous improvement. That comes back from the days I was doing factory automation for jet engines. I don’t think it’s changed.

So, scroll back up. So, we have ... So, again, as part of the ... What the ATRT3, I think, does allude to is that anybody embarking on continuous

---

improvement would first set up goals for its program and then provide regular reports on how it's meeting those goals. So, that's what that second sentence refers to.

And then, the third sentence, "The Standing Committee shall not interfere in any way with the NomCom's annual processes and its members shall have access only to publicly-available documentation." I would just revise the word "its members" to be "and the Standing Committee," to, again, make sure people don't confuse what members we're talking about. You can do that quick edit, Yvette. Is it Yvette or Jean-Baptiste who's driving here?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's Jean-Baptiste who's driving.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So, the word "its members," Jean-Baptiste, if you can just change that to "the Standing Committee members" or "the Standing Committee."

All right. So, scope of responsibilities. So, this is basically all those SO/ACs that we've listed in that spreadsheet earlier. So, we've just started off with the list. If we can scroll down a bit. So, obviously, we have NomCom leadership. We have ICANN and PTI Boards. We have ICANN Org. And then, we have all the bodies, SO/ACs, sending member to the NomCom, all the bodies that receive NomCom appointees. We have the candidates themselves. We have the external consultants and then the overall ICANN community.



---

And so, as you can imagine, the rest of the charter basically takes each one of these bullet items and talks in more detail about the role that the Standing Committee has with each one of those groups.

All right. So, group one is NomCom leadership. The bullets here ... Again, we could wordsmith this. It may be too verbose. But number one, "Oversee continuous improvement and one-time deviations to the NomCom operating procedures and ensure transparency and accountability to the overall ICANN community for these changes via online dashboards and webinars." Two, "Coordinate assessment of recommendation to the NomCom annual report."

Three, "On an annual basis, maintain and update the evaluation toolkit used by the NomCom to help facilitate the NomCom's evaluation and prioritization of candidates." Four, "On an annual basis, capture interview questions asked by the NomCom after they have been scrubbed of all identifying and personal information," and, "Seek feedback from the NomCom to help assess perceived usefulness of questions and update the evaluation toolkit, if needed." And then, lastly, "Assist the NomCom leadership with extraordinary budget requests."

Again, we'll wordsmith this. But any major objections, additions, deletions, etc.?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

A proposed deletion from me, Tom. I'm not sure what we gain by specifying how we would ensure transparency and accountability to the overall ICANN community. I think we should just finish that sentence

---

after the word “changes.” I don’t think we need to state “via online dashboards and webinars.” [inaudible] specificity there would work.

TOM BARRETT: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And the only addition I’d make is with the last point. Where it says, “Assist NomCom leadership with extraordinary budget requests,” should be “with any extraordinary budget requests.”

TOM BARRETT: Okay. All right. Thanks, Cheryl. Everyone else is good with that? I’m not sure we need to say “on an annual basis” on the other two bullets. But that just seems like a nit to me. Why don’t we scroll down to ICANN Board? So, again, this is the Standing Committee. “Coordinate with the ICANN—”

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yep. Sorry.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I just wanted to mention that there is support in the chat from Vanda, Leah, and Dave.

---

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thank you. Let me bring it up. So, Leah, and Vanda, and Dave all agree. So, the ICANN Board ... Again, this is not referring to any specific Board committees. I don't think it needs to. But, "Coordinate with the ICANN Board ..." So, I guess this ... If we can change number two to be "ICANN Board and PTI Board," so we don't overlook PTI. All right. And then, we can "Coordinate with the ICANN and PTI Boards on the job descriptions for the NomCom leadership." Well, I'm sorry. Never mind. It doesn't go there on the first bullet. Sorry about that. So, "Coordinate with the ICANN Board on the job descriptions for the NomCom leadership team."

"Coordinate with the ICANN Board on assessing ..." And here, the second one, you can say "and PTI," I guess. Yeah, "on assessing the NomCom's performance." Three, "Engage with the ICANN Board on the optimal timing for the annual appointment of NomCom leadership." And four, "Coordinate with the ICANN Board on assessing performance of reapplying NomCom appointees," which, by the way, is still a recommendation we haven't addressed yet.

So, I'll pause there. Any thoughts or comments on this section of the charter? Leah? Are you on mute?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Oh sure. Was that to me?

TOM BARRETT: Yes. Yeah. Go ahead, Leah.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah. I was looking at the question where they're assessing the NomCom's performance. Was that the NomCom's nominated members to the Board or the NomCom itself? So, they would be assessing the NomCom's performance?

TOM BARRETT: Yep. So, I think the ... I'm trying to think if I came up with this. I assume I did. I believe my intent here was to get some feedback from ... And we could do this for all the bodies receiving folks about whether or not they think the NomCom is doing a good job. Are we listening to our receiving bodies, in terms of what they're suggesting our advice is? And if we're not following that advice, are we explaining why we're not following that advice? So, it's just trying to solicit that type of feedback.

LEAH SYMEKHER: I see. All right. Thank you. I think it opens up a lot of, then, assessing how the NomCom works, operates. But maybe there would be some guidelines on how they would do that so that it doesn't interfere with the NomCom itself.

TOM BARRETT: I know one of my years, we sat down and heard back from the chair about how we totally blew our previous year's appointments. And he felt like he had provided advice. Obviously, it was either—it wasn't well-understood or it was disregarded. And he wanted to understand more why certain decisions were made. So, I was trying to close the loop on

---

---

feedback to make sure, again, we're accountable to the bodies that receive our appointees.

LEAH SYMEKHER: I see. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: And Dave has a quick comment, before I go to Vanda. He talks about coordinating with the ICANN Board on guidance for specific appointments related to diversity or specific skill sets. Dave, you're right. That's certainly part of the advice that these bodies should be providing us. I guess this point has more to do with about whether or not we listened to their guidance or misunderstood it. So, I was trying to put in a feedback loop on whether or not we're, again, doing the job that they're looking for us to do. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just because we can have lot of interpretation of this sentence and could be like I put up there ... That is NomCom with itself—something like 350 reviews among members can be the feedback from the AC and SOs. How was the performance? So, there is a lot of different interpretations. If we need one of those interpretations, better to make it more clear.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. That's certainly a good point. Yeah. And we can certainly ... I would think we would repeat this bullet later on, for the bodies

---

receiving other NomCom appointees. And maybe there needs to be a survey or something to try to find out if they think we're hitting the mark on the appointees or not. So, Cheryl has a point in the chat. I think that echoes what I said earlier. Cheryl, you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. I just want to be real sure that whatever we write here doesn't allow for future standing committees to misunderstand, mischaracterize the intention, and indeed, overstep the mark. And I'm not totally comfortable with "coordinate, coordinate, coordinate, and engage" on all of these points is specific enough. We need to make sure that ... Any good NomCom should be doing this. We need to make sure that this good practice occurs, not coordinate, and engage, and do it ourselves—ourselves being an anthropomorphism of a future Standing Committee.

Anyway, just wanted to raise that. I think we need to go over ... We will be going over this again. But just put a little pin in that as a side point and come back and see how we all feel later.

TOM BARRETT:

Yeah. Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. I take your point. I guess I don't know how a typical NomCom has the time to do—how they actually assess their performance because many of them roll off the NomCom and so they don't find out until later how well they did, unless they do a debrief somehow. But I take your point. We don't want to ... We have to figure out how to facilitate, perhaps, as opposed to coordinate. All right. No other comments on this section?

---

We shall go to the ICANN Org. And I do want to ... I think Vanda brought this up earlier. I know within the NomCom, they do these 360s about each other. But we might want to use something—some similar concept for either getting feedback from the receiving bodies or even, perhaps, doing a 360 of the NomCom staff so that they get some feedback on the NomCom members, in terms of how they could improve what they're doing. Is that a new hand, Leah?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yes, it is.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead.

LEAH SYMEKHER: I think the 360 is very individual to each of the NomCom members, which might be a bit too much, if you're looking at how each member of the NomCom performed. But there is an overall, I believe, survey that I know we did with all the candidates that gave us feedback on how we did as NomComs. And that was a really good report. And we had pretty good participants from the candidates. That was one I think that also would be good. And also, the annual report from the leadership of the NomCom, that would help. And looking at the recommendations as well. Those are maybe other sources that could be used. The 360s could be used but I think maybe it's too much. It's almost like a grading point for each member. But that's just a point of view.

---

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. No. I agree with that. I didn't mean for a 360 from external people for individual members. But I think that's a valid point. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi, Tom. Again, this is one of these we're going to have to come back to language, I suspect. But from my perspective, what the Standing Committee should be doing is ensuring consistency and regularity in feedback and self-assessment mechanisms, not ... There's externally-organized 360s and internally-organized 360s. Even the type of 360 can be very variable. So, I say that the finger on the pulse from the Standing Committee should be towards the function occurring and it being well-understood as to what it's meant to do, and what it means, and that it is in a publicly-digestible form.

How it gets there—any NomCom gets there—is really ... That may be a slower change. Do you know what I mean? 360 is a tool we have used but it's not the only tool. I always found it bizarre that—the huge differences between the externally-conducted—as in the professional 360 company that have done some of them—and the cost-cheap and cheerful ones that are done amongst their own members of a NomCom. That's like measuring apples and oranges. So, there's a need for consistency and oversight, not so much gory detailing.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. So, you would ...? I'll just read through these bullets. Then, we can talk about how we might change the language a bit to focus more on consistency—ensure consistency and oversight as opposed to coordinating.



---

So, these bullets talk about ... Again, this is ICANN Org, “Seeking feedback from and coordinating with NomCom to provide appropriate input on NomCom budget and staffing resources. Seek feedback from NomCom and review publicly-available materials to assess the effectiveness of NomCom’s outreach and marketing efforts. Work with the NomCom, ICANN Org, and the recruitment consultants to propose improvements for the following year. Coordinate with ICANN Org and NomCom members to improve training,” and finally, “Oversee the maintenance and enhancements to the NomCom online knowledge base and tools, such as the evaluation tools, interview libraries, and other relevant mechanisms.”

So, I guess the implication here is that ... Looking at the bullets I can see on the screen, the last bullet ... The knowledge base, we’re presuming, is being maintained by ICANN staff. And so, the Standing Committee would work with ICANN staff, presumably the same staff supporting the NomCom to update the knowledge base with whatever new information has been gleaned for the year.

Second to last bullet, again, “Coordinate with ICANN Org to improve training.” So, this is more of just making ... Again, NomCom staff would have to get feedback from the NomCom members about how effective the training was and use that to improve plans for the following year. Same thing for the recruitment consultants. And if we can scroll back up. “Seek feedback from NomCom and review publicly-available materials to assess the effectiveness of the NomCom outreach.” And then, “Seek feedback and coordinate with the NomCom to provide appropriate input on the budget as part of the annual budgeting cycle.”

---

So, there's obviously different ... It might help ... It don't know if it helps to be more specific about who, within the ICANN Org we're interacting with here. Any thoughts or comments on this section?

So, to your point, Cheryl, all these say "seek feedback and coordinate ..."  
Coordinate, coordinate, coordinate, right? So, you're suggesting we—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I'm assuming I don't need to repeat my previous point so I wasn't going to. The only fresh thing here would be on the first point on the top of page three, I would suggest that it would be safer to say "any recruitment consultants" as opposed to "the recruitment consultants," again because things can get written into concrete otherwise.

TOM BARRETT: Yep. And I don't know why we limit ourselves to just recruitment consultants because it could be evaluation consultants as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: "Consultant" works— "any consultants." But again, the "work with the NomCom," etc., it sort of sounds like the Standing Committee's doing the gap analysis and acting on it as opposed to causing and ensuring that the gap analysis is done and results of the gap analysis are acted on. You see the differences there? That goes back to my earlier point.

---

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I do. But I guess if I could just probe on that a little bit. So, who would do the work here and when would they do it, I guess, is the question. Right? Who's going to look at—assess, for example, the recruitment consultant and decide, “Hey. Here's how we could do it differently next year?” So, that would presumably happen after ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, if I may. That information has to be sourced from any particular NomCom because they're the ones that have worked directly with such consultants. They're the ones that have some form of opinion on the successes, failures, benefits, advantages, or disadvantages, which, of course, is only valid for their particular experience with their particular group of NomCom members. Because, for example, in training, training will vary in need from one group of NomCommers to the next.

So, there's so much variability that if we take it too far out of the NomCom core, then it's almost as bad as it not happening at all. Do you know what I mean? We've just got to be very cautious on what a Standing Committee is actually tasked to do in what should be an oversight and management role.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah. And to this point, for this particular bullet, rather than “propose improvements,” it's really making sure, as you pointed out, that the NomCom, and ICANN Org, and their supporting staff identify improvements for the following year. So, there needs to ... They ensure a process is in place to identify those improvements, to your

---

point. They're not actually doing it themselves. Vanda? Vanda, are you on mute?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Sorry. It's in the same direction. If we do not make it very clear, looks like the Standing Committee will be sitting together with the NomCom to analyze the consultants' work—to really suggest any improvements. So, like Cheryl said, it's necessary to the NomCom members to send—identify issues or overall impression about the consultants to the Standing Committee, to allow the Standing Committee to suggest some improvement or some different aspect of consultants for the next year. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Vanda. So, just a little personal opinion on my part. So, it sounds like, assuming that the NomCom gets into—resumes its regular cycle of making decisions at its June meeting, then there needs to be a debrief phase, after they've completed their selections, where a variety of topics are explicitly discussed—i.e. what did people think about the training and making sure that a survey or discussion takes place within the NomCom, before they disband, to capture their feedback and ideas for improvement for the training—for use of their consultants, etc.

And what I'm hearing is the Standing Committee just wants to make sure that process happens. It doesn't have to manage that process but to ensure that there's time allocated by the NomCom leadership to discuss those particular topics so we capture it for continuous improvement.

---

So, I believe that's what I'm hearing. And I can certainly wordsmith this some more to make sure that the process is put in place. And the Standing Committee just wants to make sure that process exists to, as Cheryl said, to collect this information so that we can identify improvements for the following year.

I know, for example ... Again, I'll bring back my own experience. One year, I think I wrote all the recommendations in an annual report. And there was no engagement with the entire NomCom about what those recommendations were going to be. And there should have been. And so, the problem was, there wasn't an event allocated for the whole NomCom to get together that suggest recommendations for the following year. So, that needs to be part of the NomCom process—part of the NomCom operating procedure, so to speak.

So, we might want to, in fact, once we finalize this charter or get it further along—is then to go over to the operating procedures and make sure that they reflect activities that the Standing Committee has—is anticipating that they will do, such as solicit this type of information.

Let's go to the next session. So, bodies that appoint members to the NomCom. So, again, the word choice needs to be modified here but, "Work with the organizations that appoint members to the NomCom to provide revisions to the NomCom member ..." Again, I guess we're going to focus on making sure process is in place for this to happen and not actually engage in the process, to Cheryl's point.

Two, "Provide support, where requested, to the SO/ACs to help ensure that NomCom members are selected for their entire ..." So again, the

---

Standing Committee won't provide the support. They'll make sure the process exists for this to happen. And then, third, again, "Help improve NomCom's selection decisions by assessing the performance and needs of all bodies receiving ..." Okay. This, I think was deleted. I think that's why it's in red because it's in the wrong section. Is that right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: It looks like it was added, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. It was in another section and was moved to here?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I think the problem is on the spreadsheet, it was in this section because the next section, five, was missing from the spreadsheet. So, this should be deleted entirely because it is ... As you'll see, it's repeated down in number five. So, if you can just delete this, Jean-Baptiste. All right, any other ...? Any comments or additions to number four?

All right. Number five. These are bodies that receive NomCom appointees. So, this, obviously, should mirror much of what we saw from the Board. "In cooperation with the NomCom, perform annual outreach to the ICANN Board, ICANN's SO and ACs, and the PTI to receive feedback on the desired skills and diversity." All right. So again,

---

all of this has to be phrased in terms of making sure the process exists. So, we'll do another pass on this.

“Oversee the system for providing feedback to the NomCom, regarding the contributions and participation of members up for reappointment to the NomCom.” So, this is really a placeholder. We have a recommendation we haven't addressed yet that talks to how this might happen. So, you'll see the word “process” appear in the next version of this.

Third, “Help improve NomCom selection decisions by assessing the performance and needs of all bodies receiving NomCom appointees. All right. So, it needs a little work there. Any other—in terms of other bodies receiving ...? In terms of other comments or changes to this, any thoughts, aside from the fact we want to make sure everything's oriented towards putting into place the process for these things. And the work, of course, is going to be done by mainly NomCom staff, in this case.

All right. Number six, candidates applying for NomCom positions. Again, making it clear that there's no direct interaction with the candidates themselves by the standing committee. It says here, “Ensure the objective for unaffiliated Board directors is included in public job descriptions and is part of the recruitment and assessment processes. Participate in the formulation and timing of annual surveys to NomCom applicants. Subject to privacy and confidentiality limitations, review the annual applicant survey results.”

---

And, “In coordination with the NomCom, provide feedback to the incoming NomCom, in order to improve the NomCom’s interaction with candidates. Refer non-selected candidates to suitable opportunities elsewhere within the ICANN community.”

So again, this will be revised to talk about making sure that’s there a process for each one of these. So, we won’t necessarily refer non-selected candidates. But we’ll ensure that a process is followed to suggest they have—they pursue other opportunities. All right. Any thoughts or comments on six?

All right. Number seven. “Assess the effectiveness of training provided to NomCom members and leadership and recommend improvements.” So again, this is a survey that you would take to the NomCom members and leadership, again, conducted by staff. Two, “Annually review the document that sets out the roles and the responsibilities for the recruiting consultant. Seek feedback from the NomCom. Propose amendments to this document.” Three, “If applicable, review the document that sets out the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation consultant.”

All right. So, all these can be simplified. It’s a little verbose. But basically, it talks about each of the different consultants. The fourth one, “Refine the standardized tools used to evaluate and prioritize candidates. If applicable, create and maintain a feedback mechanism with the NomCom to assess the effectiveness of the external consultants, based on the feedback ...” All right. So, that seems like a more general statement.



---

So, this section needs a bit of work. So again, the whole idea of refining the evaluation tools is something that is really—is done prior to the seating of the NomCom. It typically would involve the NomCom leadership and ICANN staff. And in some cases, it could be a process that takes quite a while.

So, this is ... I don't know how this happens today. I know [Gia] could probably talk to this, in terms of how much time is spent prior to the seating of a NomCom, in terms of thinking about how to do things differently. I assume as soon as the leadership team is seated, that's something they start to address prior to the kickoff of the new cycle. But again, this needs some wordsmithing here. And again, this last bullet seems to have a sentence thrown in there that is more—not quite specific to that bullet. So, we have to do some editing there.

Let's move down to number eight. So, overall ICANN community. So, "Maintain the permanent NomCom pages." So, again, we won't use the word "maintain." But we are trying to create a permanent NomCom page on the website. It does not exist today, for some reason. You only see pages for each annual NomCom. So, as we are trying to build institutional memory, that will be the glue that points the community to the institutional memory—to the version of the operating procedures, any changes that might be made from year to year, etc.

"Conduct community outreach in advance of the Standing Committee on NomCom leadership enacting material changes to the NomCom operating procedures." And three, "Work with ICANN Org to ensure timely publication of publicly-available data on the candidate pool." And again, this third bullet is done already, today, by NomCom leadership.

---

So, this is really not intended to duplicate that effort. Any thoughts or comments? Yeah. I see [Gia]'s note.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Perfect.

TOM BARRETT: "NomCom staff does need a leadership team before the AGM to go over lessons learned and plan out the year." And okay. Any other ...? So, are we good on ...? Was there any ...? Someone else have a comment?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry. I'm pushed up against another meeting. So, I was hoping that you might take this as a break point for today's thrill-packed and exciting adventure. I did want to say that, to me, it seems that something very important is missing right at the top of the charter document. And that is the statement that this is not a decision-making body.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So, way at the top, in terms of the charter. So, to your point, we ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. When I write a charter—when I write the charter—up at the top, the nature of the entity is defined. And one of those definitions—

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]