
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Welcome, everybody, to the NomCom Implementation Working Group meeting number 59 on the 5th of November 2020 at 13:00 UTC. I will quickly do the rollcall and pass the microphone to Tom to go through the agenda today. From the working group today, in attendance, we have Tom Barrett, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jay Sudowski, Lean Symekher, Remmy Nweke.

We also have apologies from Vanda Scartezini. And from ICANN Org, we have Brenda Brewer, Jennifer Bryce, and myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez. I will now ask everyone whether you have any updates to your statement of interest. If so, please raise your hand. I don't see any. Thank you. And just for the record, Jia from ICANN Org has also joined the call right now. Tom, over to you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. So, here is the agenda today. Again, see if there is any additional input on the training recommendations. Review the progress report and the summary of bylaw changes sent off to the board, and then, also, take a look at what recommendations we have remaining, and then any other business.

So, if we can jump right into the first item, this was a request from ICANN staff who are in the process of developing the training for the upcoming NomCom cycle, and whether or not this working group wants to weigh-in with any ideas or suggestions regarding how to proceed with that. I have some thoughts on this but I'll open it up, first, to see if anyone else has any reaction to this.

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.

All right, seeing no hands. So, I think in terms of what our role might be—I think this might be from Jia and some other folks—is ... In terms of process, I do think this should probably be an annual survey conducted after training to try to get a sense of how effective the training was by the attendees, and that would probably flow into some sort of a report, an annual report from the NomCom, as well as something the Standing Committee could take a look at.

So, I don't know if we have any specific training recommendations since we haven't really participated in recent training exercises. I see Jay on the line. Maybe, Jay, you can talk to whether or not you thought there was any training that was missing that you thought, maybe, would be productive or worthwhile to have, to add to the curriculum.

JAY SUDOWSKI:

Yeah. This past cycle, we did a large training around unconscious bias, which was very helpful. I think one of the challenges with training in general is just the additional time commitment it generates for the committee. I think the unconscious bias training was very helpful. I didn't feel that we were missing, specifically, anything. It's hard to say.

I feel like every kind of committee is a little bit different. I know we ended up doing the unconscious bias last year because there is just, in recent years on NomCom, and I imagine it's not going to change any time soon, such an emphasis on the notion of diversity and what that really means, and I think when you have people on the committee from ten or 11 different countries that have very different perspectives on the world, we all bring a different viewpoint of what diversity is.

And so, I think that helped future discussions that we were able to have about diversity, and where people were coming from. And so, we didn't have as much contention as we had in the past around that issue. But I think it's hard to say because every committee is a little different.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jay. So, did you have any other training, besides that particular type of training?

JAY SUDOWSKI: No. As leadership, we kind of delivered training to the committee around what the NomCom is, and what we do, and the different roles, and all that stuff. But that was all internal, if that makes sense.

TOM BARRETT: Yep. So we have, in our recommendations ... There are three recommendations. One has to do with training the rank and file about what it means to be a board director. So, was there any training about that, or is that something that the leadership provided?

JAY SUDOWSKI: The leadership provide something that ... I also met with the board governance committee and had a good conversation with them about their actual experiences on the board and what that looked like kind of moon an individual basis. And then, obviously, we get some perspective on that from John Jeffrey in terms of he comes in and talks to the committee about fiduciary responsibility to the committee and fiduciary

responsibility to the board, and individual board members, and things like that.

TOM BARRETT:

So, I think what the input or role we could play here is that ... I mean, it's great you had this training for ... I don't know if you call it "subconscious" or "unconscious" bias. But it would be great, for example, as part of an institutional knowledge that we ... Because every year, it seems to be the NomCom trying a different type of training. And then, the following year, the NomCom tries another type of training.

So, it would be great to, again, have a record of this somewhere on a website, the NomCom website, and an assessment about, "Oh, gee, this was a good idea," or, "this didn't work out too well this year." Because again, there's not a lot of visibility to the type of training that, perhaps, was followed and whether or not it was a worthwhile thing to do.

So, I think that's probably the role that the review group and the Standing Committee might play here, as opposed to getting more into the weeds about the training itself, but really making sure we're getting feedback on it. Again, the recommendations are specific.

One is about rank and file understanding the roles of a board director, two is about making sure the leadership gets whatever training they need to be a leader, and three on how to effectively evaluate candidates, are really the three recommendations that we're trying to incorporate and add some structure to. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. I think there's an opportunity here to have, still at a high level, a set of core recommendations, or core-type training recommendations, that meet each of these, rec two, and three, and four.

And that is that we should be able to implement a system where there is a publicly available, so the rest of the community knows what is going on, indication of the training that will be undertaken to meet each of these recommendations.

I'm not suggesting we have to say this style of course over that, self-paced learning over a webinar-style or a set of styles that are some hybrid or other, and I'm not even suggesting that we need to come down very specifically on whether or not things like training for leadership should not, indeed, be conducted in the main before they take up their roles.

And again, that leads you into self-based, externally accredited, blah, blah, blah. But I think that the principles can be more specifically outlined and managed by the Standing Committee. But I think we do need to ensure that some form of training, there is an expectation, will be done meeting these articulated needs.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I think that's a great point, Cheryl, so that we know at the start of the cycle what training is planned, and it's actually publicized on the website somewhere. Jay?

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yeah, I was just going to say that I think one rule, to echo what you're saying, for the Standing Committee to play is to help inform the

community of what training has been done. But I think there's just an issue of timing in terms of ... New chair is technically appointed as chair just after the AGM, and you're really meeting for the first time as the NomCom at that AGM.

So, there is not a lot of runway to turn up additional training, things like that. So, if you want to do something as an incoming chair, you have a very short window, really, in that August/September space to work with staff to try to figure out and find a training, and figure out a budget, and all that stuff. So, it's a very short timeline. I think, in general, the notion of a Standing Committee to look at that more broadly over a bigger period of time would be very helpful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Jay, the expectation is that training will be done in each of these areas. Therefore, budgets should be provided. And liaising with the NomCom leadership, who should, in my view, of course, come in pre-trained, be part of what you either have done before you apply and can prove it, or are doing before it is announced and it is, therefore, a done deal before you pick up your [inaudible] at the AGM.

But that aside, the other two recommendation areas, if they're expectations then a budget shouldn't be argued for, it should be [provided] and it should be a matter of "which of the following providers that we have used in the past to meet these needs do you want to use or are the other areas that we need to be trained in, in addition or instead of?" type decisions.

It should be a known time when such training will occur. For example, in some cases, actual interview technique training has been done in some Nominating Committees, and that maybe be required. As you say, it differs committee to committee, but there is still also a core set of skills which either they come with or they need training for. And even if they come with, they can probably do with an update.

JAY SUDOWSKI:

Yeah. No. I mean, I think, in principle, that all sounds lovely. I think it's the current cadence of how leadership comes on quickly, has to get thrown into things that ... We don't have the opportunity to have a menu of providers. But all that stuff should happen. That would be very helpful.

TOM BARRETT:

Sorry, guys, my computer froze. Do you hear me now? Hello? All right. So, I was talking for a while. Let me just wrap up. I think in terms of immediate recommendations, I would suggest that ICANN staff look at these three recommendations and, perhaps, have training around those recommendations. And whatever is decided, that gets publicized at the AGM to the ICANN community.

Any other final thoughts or comments on this agenda item? All right. Shall we move on? All right. So, progress report/review of recommendations. We did send off to ICANN Legal the introduction to the four or five recommendations that have bylaw impact. And so, we'll give them another week, hopefully, to get back to us before we wrap that up and send it off to the board.

So, we have a year-end progress report that will hopefully get done in December. Let's talk a little bit about the remaining recommendations. Do you have another slide on this? Okay. So, these are the three recommendations that we haven't started yet.

Recommendation 11, senior staff which support in the NomCom should be accountable to and report to the office of the CEO. Recommendation 12, NomCom leadership should have input on the NomCom budget and staffing resources process. Recommendation 25, the NomCom should publish detailed job descriptions for board, SO/AC, and PTI board positions and should be the basis for recruiting and evaluation efforts.

So, let's just review some of these recommendations real quick. Recommendation 11, the reporting relationship for the ICANN staff. If you recall, there was another effort going on, Work Stream 2, that had to do with ICANN staff accountability. We basically were going to await the outcome of that.

So, does anyone have any update on what's happening there and whether or not that's a partner to what we're trying to do? I know it says there's an estimated completion date of Q4, 2021, a year from now. What about the overall recommendation that NomCom staff should be reporting to the office of the CEO?

I think, as for the background, pending the outcome of Work Stream 2, we don't necessarily feel like the outcome for that may suggest the NomCom staff report in somewhere else, not necessarily to the CEO. So, that's why this implementation has been held off. It may be it reports into

ICANN Legal, or to HR, or to some other department within ICANN. Any thoughts or input on this recommendation?

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yeah. Has the committee had any conversations with Göran about his thoughts on this recommendation?

TOM BARRETT: No. Nothing has been done on this recommendation.

JAY SUDOWSKI: Okay. I mean, I know I've had conversations with him about this. It kind of seems to me that, at least, the current thought within the Org is that NomCom is kind of the hot potato that nobody wants to touch, really. So, right now, it falls under legal.

I've actually talked with Göran about whether or not it could get moved under his office for the time being, regardless of what's happening with this implementation group, and he's not very enthusiastic about that idea.

So, it's an interesting dynamic where I think, hopefully, the Standing Committee will provide some sort of a buffer. But I think there is this bizarre dynamic that happens where the NomCom itself is very reliant on ICANN staff to serve its purpose and duty.

Sometimes, there's not very good communication or very good transparency from Org to NomCom leadership, which creates some

tension. So, I would imagine it's not within our remit to contemplate another [structure], but I've also had some discussions with folks about the potential for the establishment of an independent-secretariat-type solution to oversee staff support for NomCom.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you, Jay. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. Jay, I hear what you're saying, and no, we don't have latitude, here. This is the recommendation. Therefore, hot potato or not, our message to Göran is, "Tough. Catch it." So, let's have that conversation started. The question is, when do we start it? I'm perfectly happy to lead it. Göran knows me well enough by now. But there isn't wriggle room here. This is what it says. We now just need to look at how it's done.

So, we can decide that starting this off, perhaps at the beginning of the 2021 calendar year, we can formulate a time for a discussion with Göran and any of the staff he feels is relevant to such a discussion. And we just need to get the show on the road onto looking at what is to be implemented and, specifically, how.

When we have that meeting, you'll hear me say the same thing. So, I think it's just a matter of, let's put it into the planning process. Yes, it does need to involve a conversation and we simply need to decide when we have it so that it can be implemented by our planned date.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. And do we know if there has been any progress on this Work Stream 2 that might weigh in on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't think anything in Work Stream 2 is going to change anything about it at all. We may as well just go with the recommendation. As I'm on the shepherding team for Work Stream 2, I doubt that I'd be telling them any different.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So, that kind of addresses step one, then. We're saying it's not material right now. So, step two is communicating with ICANN Org about this recommendation. It sounds like, perhaps, we should be preparing a letter to Göran to give him a heads up about this recommendation and, perhaps, come up with some questions to ask him to facilitate a meeting. Does that make sense? [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think it sounds like a perfect point to make in our next report because that's appropriate for the time, that that would be our plan. I don't think we need to do it now, I think we need to state in our next report that is what is to be done, and then do it. That way, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee is aware of it as a specific issue, it's being called out, and, by virtue of the fact that we will even ... That report in and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee is aware, we can also request that they action, because they're an interface between the board, an appropriate interaction between us and the office of the CEO.

TOM BARRETT: I mean, I think, perhaps, we could start a draft before year-end on this. I'm not sure we [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, we can draft to our hearts' content, Tom. But I'm also very aware of how much is on the board's plate and Göran's plate between now and the end of the calendar year. We will have reported by the end of the calendar year. So, you can draft a letter in addition to putting it in the report and getting the OEC [inaudible].

TOM BARRETT: Okay, great. So, that's what I suggest we do as a next step for this recommendation, we start putting together our thoughts for Göran. Next recommendation that we haven't looked at yet. So, NomCom leadership should have input on the NomCom budget and staffing resources. Obviously, that is already underway.

Again, this is probably something that the Standing Committee needs to be involved in. There is a communication mechanism in place today that I assume goes out to ICANN staff to give them a heads up on the budget cycle. They would have to pull in the Standing Committee when that call goes out. I would say the Standing Committee itself could have it on their calendar about when to expect that to happen. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Just to note, Tom, that the ICANN budget process is a well-known set of timings. So, it obviously is up to our NomCom staff to flick a switch, and get the interactions going, and, in fact, draft the actual budget requesting.

But I think it shouldn't be onerous with proper project planning for that mini timetable to be sorted out and established. But the cycle of ICANN budget, and budget requests, and planning from a staff perspective, as well as from a community interaction with the prepared proposed budgets—remember, that happens later—are well-known times.

And so, we really just need to get the magic to happen, and I'm quite confident that the NomCom staff, with all the experience that they've got, should be able to assist us with that quite quickly. I'm not sure that we're going to have it completed by Q4 2020, though. I think that might need to be slightly modified, because Q4 2020 is raring down the barrel right now.

TOM BARRETT: All right. In fact, the dates here say Q3 2020 would have provided this mechanism or process. So, we have already missed these dates.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oops. Yep. Oops. Let's modify the date. I don't know about anyone else in this meeting, but we haven't been slacking off and I think it's okay to report these things have been adjusted.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, step one, we basically haven't started this recommendation. So obviously, the completion dates are all off. In terms of a work product, it's talking about coming up with a process. I guess this should have to be ... It says for NomCom leadership.

Jay, I don't know if you have participated in the budget process—future budget process, not ad hoc changes. And the question is, this is intended to be NomCom leadership already thinking about next year's budget. I don't know if that's something they have given thought about.

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yeah. I mean, right now that's still really a function that function that Org handles.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. And even back in my day, the actual NomCom leadership input was, dare I say, barely minimal, if not almost obscured, if not difficult to get to happen. There was this magically sized pot of money that we kept asking to have access to and we either did or didn't get it. The mystery needs to disappear. The Standing Committee will assist. The lack of tabula rasa approach will also help, but it is certainly something that needs to be put into place. Sadly, I don't think it can be put into place for this current, new NomCom, but our timing should try and do it for the 2022 NomCom.

TOM BARRETT: Right. So, we just need to write down that process, I think, will be incorporated. It's probably a process with the Standing Committee and its charter, which already talks about its involvement with assisting with

this. And so, something just needs to be drafted and added to a timeline somewhere for this recommendation. So for now, though, we'll change the completion dates.

Again, I think all these dates could bump out until 2021, Jean-Baptiste. I would say Q2. The first one here can be Q1 2021. Everything else, we'll get this bumped out accordingly. All right. Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. Next recommendation that we haven't looked at?

So, this is the recommendation that the NomCom published, detailed job descriptions of all their open positions. So, the job descriptions in combination with specific needed competencies identified each year by the NomCom should form a basis for recruiting in evaluation efforts.

Again, I think a lot of this is already done for the most part. I mean, parts of it is already done by each year's NomCom. And so, it's making it a more formal process, a more public process, so that the community knows what the NomCom is seeking for candidates and it is, in fact, shared with all the recruiting consultants, as well.

So, I'm not sure there is any mystery, here. It's more part of the NomCom operating procedures, so we want to make sure, at some point, that this recommendation finds its way into the operating procedures. And that's it. Any other thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. And that's one we just report on that we will be starting that in the beginning of 2021. So, [currently not Q] 2021. So, you'd be able to do that

with a February 2021 kick-off. So, our December reporting can say that cab off the rank is expected to leave then.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Any other thoughts or comments on this? All right. Pretty straightforward. Next agenda item. Did you want to ...? Go ahead. So, do we have any ...? I know we made some last-minute changes to the intro to the bylaws last week. Are people interested in reviewing those once more, or should we move on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm all for move on but, you know, that's me.

TOM BARRETT: We did make some minor changes to the actual bylaw language, if you recall. I don't think they were material to what we're trying to do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I recall, and I think we can move on.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Super. Let's talk about next agenda item. So, I believe it's—

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'm sorry. Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I can't raise my hand. I just wanted to say that what you have reviewed right now are the recommendations that were untouched until now. But there are also the recommendations where, if you recall, there was some outreach that was done in January.

But then, afterward, since there was some focus on the recommendations, including the ones for the bylaw updates, those were not worked on since January. So, I've also reported those in the slides. I don't know whether you want to go through them because those which you have covered so far were the two agenda items for today's call.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Let's do that, Jean-Baptiste. We had another question. The question I had was, we had this intro to the bylaw changes that we sent off. Hopefully, we'll send off before year-end to the board for review. The bylaw update process is one managed by the board. And so, I guess we'll have to have a conversation with them in terms of what role they want this working group to play for the bylaw update process. Do we help lead the public comment, or does that get led by the board itself? Do we just sit back and watch?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It gets led by the board itself. That's a well-known and established set of procedures for the board, managing that process, and we step back and have absolutely nothing to do with it, [delightfully so].

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. So, you're saying we just ... So, do we also, in parallel, do any public outreach, or do we just let the board manage all that? What's your take on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a board-managed process. Any of our work would be done well before the proposed drafting language goes from the board to the public comment process.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So, do we want ... So, specifically regarding ... I'll pick on two recommendations, the rebalancing one which talks about changing the GNSO appointees and the desire for unaffiliated directors. Should we do any public outreach in Q1 2021, or are we done doing public outreach on those until the conclusion of the board process?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can but we certainly don't need to. I don't know how much of a career choice everyone wants to make of doing this, but I think we've probably got our plates full enough. But then again, I want to just get this job finished. So, that's my motivation—somewhat different to warm and fuzzies with the community. Certainly, we can, but we certainly don't need to under what our role is.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Great. Any other thoughts or comments on this before we move on? All right.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom, if I may ask a question to the working group? Just to go back on the second progress report and for planning purposes, for when would you like to have an updated version submitted for review to the working group?

TOM BARRETT: For what, Jean-Baptiste? I'm sorry.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Well, so that we can all—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For our next report. We've got our six-monthly report looming. I thought that's kind of what we're trying to get a lot of this work agreed upon, so it goes into that report.

TOM BARRETT: Right. So, did you want to mention those other recommendations, Jean-Baptiste? You had questions.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, yeah. Sure, sure, sure. But my only question was, I will be preparing for you the second progress implementation report, and I just wanted to ask you, for when would you like it to be ready for review during one of your plenary calls?

TOM BARRETT: Well, I would push that back to you, and when you think you can be ready. We can talk about our meeting schedule for the rest of the year and take a shot at that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would suggest, if we're going to be having it handed in by end of calendar year, we need to be looking at the draft final, which should have no surprises, let's face it. You're simply working from the work we've done, but it is appropriate for us to have a run-through. So, I would think that an early, if not mid-December, time would be appropriate to allow at least two meetings: an introductory and a "have you found anything? If so, let's sign off on it" approach to at least two of our December meetings.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, December 1, we would have a draft, let's say. Let me know if that's doable.

[JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:] Sure. Okay. Thank you for the feedback.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. So, did you have a question about some other recommendations?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah. I guess, since you have talked already about Recommendation 2, 3, and 4, there are some of the recommendations, as I mentioned, where some outreach was done and where it was left off. So, the first one is Recommendation 5.

TOM BARRETT: So, Recommendation 5 had to do with ... Again, the dates are Q4 2020. To revise a current timeline for BGC and others to provide the incoming NomCom with job descriptions and other relevant information for the recruitment process. All right. So, this is where this gets back to the timeline and making sure that these sorts of detailed events get captured on a timeline.

So, why don't we go through your list? But obviously, we have to go back to the timeline and finalize what the timeline is for communications with

the BGC. Six. Again, it just says, “Q3 2020 for creating an overview document that summarizes the responses for what role the evaluation consultant would play with the current job descriptions.”

So, you’re saying we haven’t quite done this outreach? We’ve done the outreach. You’re saying we haven’t created an overview document that summarizes the responses. And then, we would have to draft a proposed role description and statement of work for a professional evaluation consultant, based on input. Okay. And both of those say “Q3 2020.” So, obviously, we’ll have to update the dates. Okay. Yeah. I think we’ll have to update the dates to Q1 2021. Okay. Next one.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah. Recommendation 16.

TOM BARRETT: Implement and codify a system for providing feedback to the NomCom regarding the contributions and participation of members up for reappointment by the NomCom. All right. So, we did some outreach to this. And then, step three, here, “Identify whether improvements should be made to the timing of this exchange of information.”

And four, “Draft a communication process and timeline, including desired information to be shared by the NomCom,” and that’s Q2. All right. So, step three is the one that we are ... So, I think step three, as part of the outreach, we could go through the outreach, the responses, again.

But I think we asked if there could be any improvements. Obviously, I think one improvement would be to publish the timeline and set

expectations with the receiving bodies about when they need to provide this sort of input. So, that does not exist today. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think the receiving bodies are asked to provide any sort of input on candidates that might be reapplying for their NomCom appointments. So, that process doesn't even—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It depends. No, Tom, it does, and it's often done informally. It varies between receiving bodies as in how it is approached. Some support organizations, for example, have a very different approach to one of the advisory committees, for example. So, there is nothing new in [a does our ability].

What is to be new and what is to be done is the codification of it as an expectation and a timing that everyone will know about. And obviously, it needs to work with having happened before the changeover of leadership for the receiving bodies because it's of very little use to ask brand new leadership, who may or may not have any experience at all on the people that we're talking about, and how they performed in a previous committee or council.

So, I think there are a few points in some timelining that we can, effectively, do. And I think, perhaps, that could be appropriate work in preparation for our final report. And by the same token, if we don't get it done, we'd only be pushing it to the beginning of the 2021 calendar year. So, it would only be Q1 2021 that it would be delayed, and three and four would still be on-task to give us our endgame.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Okay. So, I changed the completion date to Q1, here. And in terms of what work we can get done for the remainder of the year, perhaps we go back and review some of the timelines we're working on and see if we can't make those into a format that ... Review them, and see if those are things that are appropriate for the final report. Okay?

Next recommendation. Publish a candidate communication schedule and codify communication process with candidates. Again, these dates, Q3 2020. Talk to previous NomCom appointees to understand how they perceived the communication process. So, that implies we were doing some sort of questionnaire.

On two and on three, "Propose a communication schedule, including timing of communications, with both successful and unsuccessful candidates." So, Jay or Jia, was there a survey done recently with candidates that, perhaps, we could take a look at some of the data?

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yeah, we do have a survey, I think. I think it probably is okay to share.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, if you just redact all the names or something.

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yeah. No, I mean it's anonymous. We don't even see ... You know what I mean?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

JAY SUDOWSKI: The names. But we do have surveys, at least from this cycle, and I know the last cycle.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. And again, this refers to a timeline. So, that's a common theme throughout this whole review, coming up with some detailed timelines. The NomCom already has a general one that it publishes, but we'll basically develop more detailed timelines for ... All the SO/ACs and all the parties the NomCom interacts with has its own timelines and deadlines that we want to make sure there is visibility to. So, that's what this is, a communication schedule, here, that talks about timing, as well, that we want to codify, as well. All right.

So all this, hopefully, will come out in the annual report but, certainly, we want to go back and start seeing if there is a nice way to present that information. So, if you just update the dates at a minimum, Jean-Baptiste? Yeah. Maybe what I suggest is, in terms of homework, you could circulate off-list the link to some of the timeline information we're working on so that the group can think about, offline, how to present all this stuff in a report.

Next recommendation? 18. So, this has to do with developing a marketing plan for the NomCom that, hopefully, would be a year-out marketing plan, not just one for two or three months, for recruiting the current openings. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is one I really think, to do justice to it, we've just got to push the dates out and go, "There you go. We've fallen behind. Boo-hoo." Because it needs some decent work and I think it's decent work for the beginning of next go of the year.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Update the dates. Recommendation 20, the evaluation consultant should undertake a preliminary screen of all board candidates and provide blinded assessments to the NomCom to assist the NomCom with reducing the pool of candidates to the deep-dive shortlist.

So, this is a very specific recommendation on how to do evaluation. Again, it talks about, we're down to step two, "The working group to establish when in the NomCom cycle the shortlist should be produced to have a maximum benefit for the NomCom." Obviously, that date is off.

And then three, "If necessary, work with ICANN Org to amend the evaluation, [confirm] contract with a need to provide blind assessments and propose a deep-dive shortlist of the applicant pool while preserving all application materials, etc. All right.

Obviously, the dates need to be updated. Any other thoughts or comments about this recommendation, how we should approach this? This kind of gets into the science of the evaluation process and trying to make it, I guess, more scientific or rigorous. Does everyone agree? No, no. Does everyone understand what's meant by a blinded assessment, and do we think that needs to be defined better?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I mean, I certainly understand it. But if in doubt, always make a clear definition with an example. Because not everybody, especially in a multi-lingual world, will understand it. I happen to come from a science background, so blind assessments make perfect sense to me.

Once we've updated the dates, I am, again, going to say I think this is work that will take some attention. Not a huge amount of it, but it does need some very specific attention. So, let's update the dates and plan to do it effectively in, probably, the beginning of, again ... Or maybe the Q2 of the next year. But if in doubt, give an example or a boxed-out definition.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, I agree, Cheryl. I don't think it's going to be clear to many in the community what "blind assessments" means, so perhaps we want to add a step to this plan to define that—as you say, give some examples. Because right now, according to this plan, our next step is all about timing. So, we're not stopping to define this at all. So, can we add a 1(d) step saying, "Define blinded assessments and provide examples"? Everyone okay with that?

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yeah. I'm very just generally curious about how this is going to work because I think it's one thing to have a blinded methodology, some sort of a scientific experiment or process. But when you're looking at people's lives, I think it's much harder.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Remember the blinded ... Sorry, Tom, Jay. The blinded assessment is for use at a point in the process. It's trying to reflect what is seen as a "good practice," notice I don't use the word "best practice" anymore but a good practice, in candidate evaluation from the wider world, and apply it to the NomCom within ICANN processes. So, that's what this recommendation is all about, and this recommendation says what it says.

So, the indication is that provision of blinded assessments will be part of the toolkit future NomComs are able to access and should get, and this is simply saying, if necessary, contracts, expression of interest documentation, etc., job description for any such EOIs for the work of being an evaluator, need to make sure that it's part of the capabilities of any such future evaluator.

So, I think, without us needing to herniate over the pros and cons, and what our personal views are on it, it is what the review recommendation, as accepted, is saying ought to happen. And what we've designed is how we think we can make it happen but it looks like the definition is probably a good idea.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Thanks, Jay. Yeah, I actually was going to withdraw my suggestion because, reading through this again, I think it had kind of been defined in step one, here. And steps 1(a), 1(b), and 1(c) make it clear that this is just one part of the process. It doesn't limit the NomCom's choice of candidates in any way, so it doesn't necessarily drop people off the list, it just gives them input without, perhaps, introducing a bias of who the

candidates are, or where they're from, etc. So, I think this is ... I'm going to withdraw my suggestion to add another step. Looking at the dates, here, we just need to update the dates.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You know, Tom, it strikes me it's almost part of the little mini-training that should be standard for all NomComs: a "what on Earth does all of this mean? Oh, it's part of a toolkit! Oh, okay. We're all right with it, then." I mean, we kind of need to ... There are probably a few of these things that ... We're not working with teams of human-resource-trained professionals, and therein lies the rub. A number of these recommendations are trying to do the best they can with the material we have to work with in the black box of what future NomComs may or may not be [inaudible].

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. That's a good point. And again, this gets back to all about timing. And so, that NomCom life timeline that gets published every year, perhaps it needs to start getting ... To highlight ... And this is where we're going to do a blind assessment, just so people get more visibility to how the NomCom's [doing its] work. But I'm getting ahead of myself. All right. So, we're going to update the dates.

Any other recommendations you want to look at? Again, we have a date issue here, for a standardized tool to evaluate and prioritize candidates. So again, the bigger issue would be on blinded assessment, but how do we do assessment overall? And coming up with, again, the toolkit, as Cheryl said. So, we just need to update the dates, here, to 2021.

Same thing, here. We have to update some dates about consistent interview questions and an interviewer evaluation form for a toolkit. So, if we can update the dates on this Jean-Baptiste? 23, additional data on the candidate pool. We'll update all these dates. 25, assessing the performance and needs of all bodies receiving appointees. So again, we need to update the dates.

And 26, advancing the nomination process for the non-selected folks into a leadership development function. The dates here are okay. So, no change required here. Any other business before we get into the next meeting? Do you have a list of next meetings, Jean-Baptiste? Awesome. So, November 12th and November 19th. It would probably help if we ... And that's it for this month. I've called off a meeting on the 26th.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, should we try and set our December dates so we've got them calendared? I just think that could be useful.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Following the same cycle. I'm not suggesting a change of cycle, I'm just suggesting we get the dates up.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, the first three Thursdays in December, December 3rd, the 10th, and the 17th. So, after these two meetings, we have three more meetings. So, if we can shoot for, surely, by December 1st, a rough draft of the annual report, that gives us three meetings to finalize that report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a plan, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Any other business, guys? Are we done?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Thanks, everybody. Bye for now.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Brenda, if you can stop the recording? Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]