

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Welcome, everyone, to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group meeting number 60 on the 12<sup>th</sup> of November, 2020, at 19:00 UTC. I'm going to do a quick rollcall and ask if you have any updates to your statement of interest.

So today in the room, from the NomCom Implementation Working Group, we have Tom Barrett, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Vanda Scartezini. From ICANN Org, we have Pamela Smith, Yvette Guigneaux, Chantelle Doerksen, Teresa Elias, and Jia-Juh Kimoto, and finally, myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez.

Today, we have apologies from the working group from Nadira Al-Araj and Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, and apologies from Jennifer Bryce from ICANN Org. I'm going to ask you whether you have any updates to your statement of interest. If that is the case, please raise your hand. All right. Not seeing any. For the record, we have Arinola Akinyemi joining, just now, the room. Tom, over to you to go through the agenda. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. So, just a reminder for everyone. We have about five more meetings before the end of the year and we have a year-end report that we want to get out in this timeframe. And so, today we'll talk a little bit about what I call the "NomCom processes," but we won't spend too much time on that.

And then, I wanted to talk about how we make sure that our [operations] recommendations, we have identified the right deliverables and

---

*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.*

---

transition to Standing Committee, and then we can talk about the three recommendations we haven't touched yet to see if we can, at least, identify a path forward for each of those recommendations. Shall we go to the next slide?

So, NomCom processes. Just as a reminder, we have the 2019 timeline as an example, here, as a kind of dumbed-down version of what the NomCom does in a very readable version. This was somewhat disrupted in 2020, as you recall. I just at the last minute realized ... I don't know if you can put up a 2020 timeline, Jean-Baptiste, for the NomCom?

So, this is the 2020 timeline. I believe this was updated in October, so it really reflects the final process for 2020, not the originally proposed process. As you can see, there are delays/assessments going. It's a little different from the previous year. The previous year, for example, had recruitment going into March, into, in fact, the 1<sup>st</sup> of April, before the assessment started, and assessment went through to the end of June, and then July and August is selection, and then reporting out.

So, 2020, as it actually turned out, had a fairly short recruitment—according to this, it was done by the end of February—and then had fairly long assessment stretching through to August. And then, in parallel to that, a selection phase began and, of course, the reporting in September/October.

I'm assuming that the 2021 timeline will somewhat revert back to the 2019 timeline in terms of transition from one phase to the other. Jia, I don't know if you could confirm that, or do you think that the 2021 timeline will look similar to this?

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: This is a 2020 NomCom timeline, so it's going to be similar to previous years, but we are still working with the leadership for 2021 to confirm the dates.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So, you're saying it's going to look more like the 2019 dates than these dates?

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: Yes.

TERESA ELIAS: We're getting ready to do the 2021 kick-off and, once we complete that, we'll have a better idea of what the timeline will look like. So, we can say that it's possible that it will look similar to 2019, but not knowing what restrictions and how we're going to style the meetings, that will make the final considerations where we'll be able to come back and say, "This is what the timeline looks like for 2021."

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Teresa. Yeah. So, the reason I'm asking is that my thought was to use this published timeline, whatever it turns out to be, as a template for our process map. That's Recommendation 13, as well as ... Which really incorporates all the other timelines we have been talking about throughout this review, recognizing that there may be tweaks from year

---

to year. So, I just wanted to make sure we're starting from the same sort of baseline. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. I think our work really only needs to be at an indicative level, so it has got the flow and the general which-goes-before-what outline. And so, we can work from this as an example. We don't need to worry about the tweakings and the exact dates, but the general what goes before what and after the other should be the same, and blocks within, at least, quarters should be pretty good.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I think it will be interesting because some of our recommendations, for example, recommend the ... Has to do with when communications flow back and forth between the receiving bodies and the appointing bodies. I just want to make sure it's consistent with what they're thinking, here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's a perfect example of something that isn't going to be changing or influenced by whether or not things are virtual or not, or some hybrid thereof. So, some stuff will be tweakable in the actual timelines and some stuff won't, but your example is stuff that's pretty stable.

---

TOM BARRETT:

Yep. The reason I bring this up is because we are, again, hoping to use this as a template. And so, the rough-fit timing of the phases was repeated on our process map, for example. So, we will want to use whatever that is going to be for 2021, instead of 2020, because I think it, obviously, got skewed because of the delays due to COVID. So, whenever you guys have that ready, we'll apply that.

And then our challenge, obviously, with the Recommendation 13 process map, is that there is a ton more detail, probably too much to show on one page. And so, we'll have to figure out a nice way to present that information. So, I'm really focused on how we present our information. So, a lot of the recommendations have what I would call both content and processes.

So, Recommendation 1, which talks about coming up with a job description, for example, for NomCom members, is clearly content that is part of that recommendation. But there is also a process that involves reviewing that every year, circulating it to the appointing bodies, getting their feedback, updating it, etc.

So, that process has to be as part of our process map, somewhere. We want to make sure that we capture that process as part of that recommendation, for example. So, that's just a point I'm making. This is probably how we'll be spending the next five meetings, really finalizing that process map and making sure we capture both the content as well as the processes that come out of each of those recommendations. Does that make sense?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I hope we're spending some of those meetings getting our final report sorted, but anyway. Oh, I'm sorry, final for the year.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Well, I think the final report, for example, should reflect the fact. If the implementation steps don't already reflect it, we have both content and processes to deliver for most of the recommendations. Not all, but most of them.

I think, going by what ... I went back and took a look at the detailed implementation plan that we delivered, and it has implementation steps, and then it has metrics about whether or not we know if we delivered it or not. But it doesn't quite address what our work product would be, based on each recommendation.

So, I think that's probably ... If I can go back and change one thing, I would have probably revised the template for the detailed plan to make sure we were clear about what the output was going to be for each recommendation. But something we can make sure we can start to capture, now. All right. That was just my rant on processes.

So, we can go to the next slide. I asked Jean-Baptiste to take a shot at some of our timelines based on this template, but this is really not the right template we want to use. We want to wait for the 2021 template. So, sorry about that, Jean-Baptiste. I think we want to skip over ... See, this is what it looks like, some of the different templates, but I don't think these are usable, at this point. Same thing about ...

---

So, the other question I want to bring up was a bunch of the ... And again, we'll address this on a more detailed level in the next few meetings. But we do want to make it clear that, for the recommendations that have both content and process, the process is really something we're going to be probably handing off to the Standing Committee.

So, although we're developing a content, it's the Standing Committee that's responsible for the ongoing process of revising and reviewing that content. And so we want to make sure, again, as we go through the recommendations for the year-end report, that we have clearly identified when that transition occurs.

So, basically, when this working group's work is done and when the Standing Committee takes over. So, just another heads up in terms of one of the central themes that I think we'll be spending time on in the next few meetings.

All right. So, that's all I've going to say about that. Any thoughts or comments? All right. So, what I did want to try to do is look at the three recommendations that we haven't really tackled, just to ... I know most of the heavy work on this will be deferred but I wanted to see if there was anything we could kick off now in terms of ... Just so we can identify an approach for these recommendations. You want to go to the next one, Jean-Baptiste?

So, Rec 11. Again, senior staff members supporting NomCom should be accountable to and report to the office of the CEO. 12 was the budget. 15 was detailed job descriptions for the open positions.

---

So, 11, if we can talk about that for a second, what we had briefly mentioned last week was perhaps we could start drafting some questions for Göran about what the concerns were of the independent examiner, why he made this recommendation. I guess we should capture that, and perhaps ask for a meeting to discuss that, and see how ... Just get some feedback and start a discussion on how we should proceed on this particular one.

It seems straightforward but I know that we wanted to look at the workstream work and see if there was any impact of that to what we're trying to do here, which I think has to do with, perhaps, more of a job description for the ICANN staff who are supporting NomCom, more than anything else.

So the question is, is there anything we could do now in terms of starting to formulate questions, or scheduling a meeting? What's our approach for Rec 11? Any thoughts? So just to remind you, here, of the detailed steps: assess Work Stream 2 Recommendation 7 for potential impact. The initial take on that is there is no impact, or nothing we're going to be waiting for.

Two, communicate with ICANN Org about the NomCom support reporting structure. Three, assess what options there are, according to Work Stream 2. Further steps depend on the outcome of task three.

So, it's very open-ended, if you recall. I think we really punted this one. But clearly, we have to see how much resistance, if any, there might be within ICANN Org for this recommendation and if they want to have a dialog about that. So, I would suggest we schedule a meeting with



---

someone within ICANN Org to discuss this recommendation. The question is, what kind of prep do we have to do prior to that meeting? Anyone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yep. Hi, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure that the prep needs to be terribly deep. I mean, we can drag out the greater details from the ... Sorry. I don't know why I'm getting an echo, but anyway, let me try again. Anyway, the greater details from the rationales for the recommendations from the report, if needs be.

But the recommendation is the recommendation is the recommendation. We just need to find out who within ICANN. And of course, our staff should be involved. "Our." I should say NomCom staff, our NomCom staff, should be involved, as well, is the appropriate one to have a [one's the] logistics of this recommendation being implemented conversation. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. So, I guess that's a question for the ICANN staff on the call. Who do you think we should be talking to within ICANN Org about this recommendation? Does anyone have ideas?

TERESA ELIAS: Tom or Jean-Baptiste, if you'd like me to, I am happy to reach out and find out who the appropriate parties are that you should contact or address your communication to.

TOM BARRETT: That would be great, Teresa. Thank you.

TERESA ELIAS: I am taking that action item. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. And again, we're available to talk either at one of our scheduled calls in December, or we could do just a leadership call to keep it simple, at first. Maybe that's the best next step.

TERESA ELIAS: Do you want me to find out ... Since you raised the option of maybe being on the call, do you want me to see if they'd be available to participate on the call on this particular recommendation? Whoever it is that I find.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Well, I'll leave it up to them whether or not they want to start off with a smaller group or if they want to join the larger group. Obviously, there are some ... I think that the review team, here, realized that there

---

was some sensitivity about the independent examiner trying to change reporting structures within ICANN.

So, I think that that's why these steps are the way they are. There may be a counter-proposal, perhaps, that could be discussed, because time has changed and organization has changed. Certainly, I think we should have that discussion and figure out what to do with this particular recommendation. Does that make sense?

TERESA ELIAS: Understood.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

TERESA ELIAS: Yes, Tom, understood.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Teresa. All right. So, hopefully, we can hear back by the next call, Teresa. Do you think that's doable, in terms of what our next step might be, here?

TERESA ELIAS: I will start reaching out immediately, today, Tom, and see what feedback I get. I will keep Jean-Baptiste in the loop so that information is available, readily available, to you.

TOM BARRETT:

All right, thanks. Yeah, we have a call, obviously, a week from today, and then we have a week off, and then December 3<sup>rd</sup>. Okay. Thank you. All right. So that is, I think, a path forward for Rec 11. What do we have for the next recommendation? The next recommendation is the budget.

So again, as part of our process map, we obviously want to include the budget discussion. This is always tricky because the budget is always talking about next year's budget, and the current NomCom leadership team isn't necessarily concerned with the future budget, as opposed to the current budget.

Again, this has to do with, if you look at the steps, here, it says here we haven't started it. We have to work with ICANN Org to identify a process, including a detailed mechanism and appropriate timing for NomCom leadership to provide meaningful input on resources via ICANN's annual budget cycle. Why don't we stop there for a second and ... I guess the question is, is this still a valid step, or should this be the NomCom Standing Committee that's participating in this process, somehow? So, that's really what we have at the end.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I guess we already agreed that this should be for ... Because it's for the next year. So, the incumbent from NomCom could not be set for that year. So, it's for the Standing Committee, in my opinion. We had agreed with that. So, in my opinion, number one should not be as for this group to do something.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, you think we should revise one. It should have been NomCom Standing Committee as opposed to ... Okay. It does start off, however, with “working group will start this process,” right? But the question is, once we define a process, is it NomCom leadership from year-to-year who is interacting with ICANN finance? Or is it the Standing Committee?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: For me, the Standing Committee together with the leadership team. Because some of those points, like to analyze and get some feedback, and rearrange some parts of the budget, or redefine it, could be the responsibilities from the leadership team. But normally, the first step belongs to the Standing Committee, in my opinion.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Okay. So, the question is, to get this started, there is a ... Typically, ICANN finance sends out/makes an announcement that goes to all the various chairs of the SO/ACs. And so, I guess, we need to make sure that also goes out to the Standing Committee so that they are alerted to start participating in the process. And so, is there a way ... I guess the question is ... And I was kind of making some of that stuff up.

But I guess, another question for ICANN staff, is there a way to get in touch with someone—Jia, maybe you know this—to find out from ICANN finance what process they follow to alert folks that it’s time to start the new budget cycle? You get an e-mail, Jia, I assume, saying, “Hey, guys.

---

We're doing the budget cycle for this fiscal year. If you're responsible for anything, start giving us input by this date"?

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: Hi. I actually work on the operations part and the execution, so I don't get the budget e-mail. I'm not really too clear on ... Sorry, Teresa, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but is there ...?

TERESA ELIAS: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Hi, Teresa.

TERESA ELIAS: Hi. So, for the whole process, I think it would be ... I mean, there are clearly some questions that you have, that this working group has, regarding the budget process. So, I think that is something that would be bettered answered by someone within finance so that, if there are questions that you have, number one, I'm not giving you stuff that lacks detail or information, but you can also ask questions on the spot and get clear information and complete information, without blanks. So, I'm happy to find out who the working group needs to speak to in reference to this.

TOM BARRETT: That would be fantastic. Thanks, Teresa.

TERESA ELIAS:                   You're welcome.

TOM BARRETT:                   All right. So, that takes care of that recommendation, I think, as a next step. We have one more recommendation, 15, I believe, which has to do with publishing detailed job descriptions for the positions. These job descriptions, in combination with specific needed competencies identified each year by the NomCom, should form a basis for recruiting and evaluation efforts.

So, I'm not quite sure why the independent examiner felt like they had to break out specific needed competencies. I would assume those would have been in the job descriptions that were published. But nonetheless, that's what we have. So, again, we haven't started this. So, step one was going to be wait and collect the finalized job descriptions per Rec 14. I assume—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:        Didn't we review this last week?

TOM BARRETT:                   No, we didn't go through any of these steps. Did we?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:        Okay. Maybe I was in a fugue state. It just seems really familiar to me.

TOM BARRETT: Again, this is one of the recommendations that, apparently, we have not started yet. So, I'm trying to understand what we need to do [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We changed the dates. We went through them.

TOM BARRETT: We changed the dates? Well, it still says Q3. Okay, 2021.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Q3, 2021.

TOM BARRETT: As a completion date?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a start.

TOM BARRETT: That's a year from now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We moved these dates already.



---

TOM BARRETT: No, that's 2021. That's a year from now. So, those dates are too far—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know.

TOM BARRETT: Too far in the future.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're in the future because that's when we ... Whatever, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I think we added a year to the other dates but I don't think we want this to ... This particular recommendation should not take us another year to complete.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, certainly not. Most of this is normally work from the NomCom. So, I didn't see 2021/2022 as a probable date for us to finish that.

TOM BARRETT: Right, no. I mean, we should be able to get this done in a month.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When does Rec 14 collection end?

---

TOM BARRETT: Can you bring up 14 for us?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When's the completion on that?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, let's just bring up 14 really quick, if it's handy. I know it's not on this list. There we go. So, formalized communications between the NomCom and the board, SO/ACs and the PTI Board, to understand needed competencies and experience. So, we made 15 dependent on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's where I think those other dates are drawn from.

TOM BARRETT: Right, yeah. No, absolutely. So, 14, it says we already asked for additional information from these other bodies. Identify whether improvements could be made/is in process. So, we can talk about that a little bit. And then, four, draft a communication process and timeline, including desired information to be shared to the NomCom and the bodies that receive NomCom appointees, should follow each year.

---

So again, more of a process question, including what information should be shared with the recruitment agencies. And five, if applicable, updates should be made to the NomCom operating procedures. All right. So, if we go with this plan then we need to finish 14 before we can do 15.

But certainly, 15 should not take an entire year. So, we'll have to fix those dates. Even here, we have ... So, we have here step five going to Q4, 2021, which is a year from now. Certainly, not probably ... [Here's the] probably unintended updates from last week, right?

So, I think we can get this done a lot faster, again, if we can publish the processes I talked about earlier. If we can get a draft of those done in time for the year-end report then, certainly, we'll be able to get this done, as well as 15 done, pretty quickly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Hey, Cheryl. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, from that, is it a possibility, then, that we could even run some of 15 in parallel with some of 14, and that would shrink it a bit?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I don't know what we ... I forget why we made it dependent but, obviously, 15, for example—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But it's dependent at a particular point. But the whole of 14 probably doesn't need to be completed.

TOM BARRETT: I agree. I agree. So, that would certainly change all the dates and let us work on the dates on the two in parallel. So, getting back to 15, if you have that handy, assuming we're not going to wait for 14 to be done to start 15, there are already job descriptions being published by the NomCom.

So, a lot of this is just a data collection or document collection effort to collect those and make sure it's ... And I believe the NomCom is already doing this on a regular basis. They don't always get published for all the openings, I think, in the detail that is suggested here. But I certainly think that this could be done fairly quickly by Q1, 2021, rather than take all year.

So, we'll just make a note of it, Jean-Baptiste. Let's see if we can't finish this up in Q1, 2021, for the dates we have here. Jia, if I could put you on a ... I don't know if it's Jia or Teresa, but I assume the NomCom, as part of its planning right now, is going to be publishing ... I know it has published the openings but if it going to have any sort of job description this year, planning that process? I know Jay is around, too, if he wants to answer it.

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yeah, I imagine we'll continue to have job descriptions, at least for ICANN Board and PTI Board. I think, historically, we haven't published job

---

---

descriptions for other SO/AC positions. I think, functionally, those job descriptions probably need to come from those bodies, or at least have substantial input from those bodies.

And sometimes, it's hard getting any input from them, so we would welcome any more input because we want to send the SOs and ACs people that they want. We will, undoubtedly, ask them for input this year. We asked everybody last year. So, maybe one of the things that we can do, in [inaudible] is to specifically reach out to ALAC, ccNSO, GNSO, say we need some help; we'd like to build a job description.

TOM BARRETT:

Yeah, that would be great. And I'm assuming that, for example, the GNSO has a charter that describes the role of a council member, and I assume that role is not going to change, whether it's someone who came from an SO/AC or appointed by the NomCom.

JAY SUDOWSKI:

Well, I think GNSO, actually, is interesting, because most of the GNSO reps are directed by their houses, or they're sending constituencies. So, in the BC, we tell our GNSO Councilors how to vote and what to do.

TOM BARRETT:

That's a good point.

---

JAY SUDOWSKI: NomCom appointees don't have that, even, sounding board. So, it is a little weird.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Well, yeah. You'll take the lead on seeing if they can't provide at least an initial outline or something that we could use as a starting point?

JAY SUDOWSKI: Yep.

TOM BARRETT: Cool. All right. Any other thoughts or comments? I'm bringing up the chat, here. Okay. So, I feel like we have got a start on the three recommendations that we had not shown any progress on yet. So again, my goal is, by the end of the year, we would have started all the recommendations and then have, at least, a checkbox, perhaps, on one or two of these for each of the recommendations.

And I actually think that, going back to the transition I mentioned earlier between this Review Working Group and the Standing Committee, we should be able to clearly define when the Review Working Group's role is done, versus when the Standing Committee takes over. So, just to pick ... This one's on the screen, now. I know, Cheryl, the end-of-year looms.

So, Rec 15. Let's just talk about the transition, here, a little bit, to the Standing Committee, because it is mentioned, here. So, we're not waiting for Rec 14. We are, however, trying to collect some job descriptions for the job openings.

Two is, again, establishing a process. So, that's a deliverable for this recommendation, that there will be a process to make sure that, when publishing the job descriptions, the NomCom is transparent if it decides to include other factors than those received through the suggested board advice or input from other bodies that receive NomCom appointees.

In my mind, that means that, for example, if you're getting a job description from the ccNSO or ALAC before you publish it, the NomCom has a chance to revise it, and they can publish something else that is in addition to whatever they receive back.

But nonetheless, the final work product gets published by the NomCom. Once we have that process, I would say the Review Working Group is done in terms of this recommendation. Because then, we have NomCom with support of ICANN Org to update the NomCom operating procedure manual with this new process.

And then, four, assure that the NomCom Standing Committee performs annual outreach to the board, SO/AC, and PTI Board, to receive feedback on specific needed competencies. We can probably quibble about who is doing this outreach. But nonetheless, we have a process, here, that we want to develop, and then we want to have a hand-off to the Standing Committee to follow through with the next steps.

Cheryl, just reading your comment: "End-of-year looms close. Nothing wrong with the report status showing some items dark for the beginning of 2021." I agree. Okay. So, I think that's all we have for the agenda. We could start going through each detailed recommendation again if people

---

---

have the appetite for it. Are there any other slides we haven't covered yet?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to say I would appreciate not going over everything again. Like me, I'm sure, others have been on RGF meetings, and that's non-stop for I don't know how many hours.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I don't mind giving people the rest of their hour back. I think we can spend time combing through all the recommendations and doing what I talked about up-front: making sure we have clearly identified the deliverables, both content and process for each recommendation, making sure we identify the transition from the working group to the Standing Committee.

So, I want to make sure that those points are obvious for each recommendation. Take a look at the timing, again, to make sure we haven't erroneously pushed things out into 2022. I certainly we could, from a Review Working Group perspective, be able to wrap up our work in 2021. I think that would be our goal. So, if no one objects, I'll give you the rest of your hour back.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Bye for now.



---

TOM BARRETT: All right, cool. Thanks, everybody. Have a good weekend. Bye.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [David], can I stop the recording, please? Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**