JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Thank you, Brenda, and welcome everyone to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group call #61 on the 19th of November 2020 at 13:00 UTC.

I'm going to do a quick roll call and ask whether you have any updates to your statement of interest before passing the microphone to Tom to run through the agenda.

Today, in the Zoom room, we have from the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group Tom Barrett, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Arinola Akinyemi, Remi Nweke, and Vanda Scartezini joined as well.

And from ICANN Org, we have … Sorry, and just for the record, we have Dave Kissoondoyal as well who just joined. And from ICANN Org, we have Brenda Brewer, Betsy Andrews, Jennifer Bryce, Jia Kimoto, Teresa Elias; and myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez.

I would ask everyone to raise your hand in case you have any updates to your statement of interest. And seeing none, I will pass over the microphone to Tom. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT:	Thank you, Jean-Baptiste and welcome everyone. November 19, 2020. So the agenda today is a review from the input from ICANN Org legal department on the bylaw amendments, an update on action items for recommendations 11 and 12, a quick discussion about the coming deadline for the ATRT-3 final report and how it might impact our review.

And then identifying deliverables and transition from the working group to the standing committee if time allows. And let's jump right in.

So, if you could—great. I believe this was circulated on the list.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. I can project the document. I think it would be easier. It's just there. I reported the comments and the updates that were made, but I think on the document, it's [inaudible].

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Well, this is fine. Referring to the addition to the opening section 8.1, where we say, "Notwithstanding Section 7, the Nominating Committee shall ensure the nomination of unaffiliated board members for the purpose of this section reapplying NomCom Board appointees shall be deemed to be unaffiliated."

So, the comment was, first, we are not clear on the meaning or purpose of this reference. And two, they suggest that this provision is more appropriate for inclusion in the "ineligible for selection" in Section 8.8.

Any thoughts or comments on this?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda.

TOM BARRETT: Hi, Vanda. Go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I don't know why they don't understand what is the meaning and the purpose of this reference, but anyway, the suggestion to put in that section 8.8, maybe it's a good recommendation because we talk about ineligible for selection because we are saying that must be an affiliate. So, if they are affiliated, they are ineligible for that selection. So it's not so … I don't know what we could do to make it clear but the recommendation looks interesting. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Anyone else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can support the shifting to the 8.8, and like Vanda, I thought the meaning and purpose was really clear. But maybe it's forests and trees. But I question whether we need to respond to that part or not if we do the shifting. Tom, what's your read on that?

TOM BARRETT: So, what I'd like to suggest is we split this up. So, the first sentence, I think should stay. Obviously, what's missing here is the context from Section 7. So, it requires a reason to go back and find the Section 7 clause that we are referring to.

And I wonder—I don't have them handy. I wonder if there's a sub-clause there that we can get more specific. But that's one point. We can go back and maybe it's 7.2 or 3.

The second sentence, certainly I wouldn't mind moving somewhere else. It's not needed here. But I think the first sentence should stay. Is there a more specific Section 7, Jean-Baptiste? Maybe you can bring up that section of the bylaws.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, just give me one second.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, because I think this does provide a differentiation for how the NomCom is going to select directors versus the other board directors. I think it's worth stating this up front.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If memory serves, we actually will be referring to a couple of subsections in 7 and I think that's why we ended up just mentioning section 7, rather than going 7.3, 7.2. But let's gild the lily and make sure that the sub-sections are specifically listed or we use clarifying words, if not words that link to the specific [subtext].

This is one of those that we could discuss, though, in fair details. I wouldn't want to not have that sentence. I'm happy to change it.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. So, 7.1 talks about composition. 7.2 talks about where the directors are coming from. I don't think it's either one of these, so could we scroll down?

So, 7.3 is criteria for nomination of directors, so [certainly] we … And then 7.4 has additional qualifications. And 7.5 …

So, here's a thought. Maybe the word "notwithstanding" is the wrong word. Maybe it should say "in addition to". Something like that. I might have to pull out my dictionary and make sure "notwithstanding" is the right word choice there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm always happy to not just … I mean, "notwithstanding" is something that you see constantly throughout bylaws. We don't have to always use that word. Let's find another one. That works for me.

TOM BARRETT: Certainly, it's a legal term and maybe it's being interpreted a certain way that isn't obvious to us. Just a thought.

Okay. So, I think you're right, Cheryl. There are several sections here. There's no one. I mean, we could certainly be more specific, 7.3, 7.4. But I'm not sure that helps. They should just go back and read section 7.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's just go with the "in addition to" as opposed to the "notwithstanding" type thing. We can see if that gets through more comfortably.

TOM BARRETT:	Okay. So, can we switch back, Jean-Baptiste? All right. I'm going to leave it as is and we'll see if we can come up with a better word. I just want to verify the definition of notwithstanding. But I think this sentence should stand as is [inaudible] first one. I have no problem with moving the second one to the later section, as they suggest. So, why don't we do that?

All right. Comment on 8.2. They reordered and removed duplicative text. I saw they what they did. I think it's fine. So no objections to what they did there. I don't know if anyone else has any objections. It may help just to go to their redline document at this point so people can see what we're talking about, Jean-Baptiste. There you go.

So they just reorganized this and it says everyone is now a voting delegate. They just put everyone, just made a straightforward list and they were able to save some separate sections. Again, no material changes as far as we're concerned here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:	For me, okay.

TOM BARRETT:	Scroll down, Jean-Baptiste. All right. Down to terms. Everything else is fine. Again, you'll notice on Section E, they simply collapsed the GNSO to be seven voting delegates. Very clean. We'll discuss that one later.

Section 8.3, again just cleaned up the language here. So, I think this change is fine. I wonder … At one point, we were talking about … No, I

think this language is fine. I've got no issues with any of these edits either. Does anyone else have any objections?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, keep scrolling down. So, Section E, again, they just cleaned up the language. I have no objections to their edits there. Same thing for F. So we can keep scrolling. Raise your hand or speak up if you want to talk about anything.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom, I can't raise my hand but there are several comments that were made that maybe the group wants to address.

TOM BARRETT: Comments in the chat or …?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, no, no. Comments from the legal department.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Why don't you let us know which ones you think we should address, Jean-Baptiste? I don't object to any of these.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there anything controversial at this point?

TOM BARRETT: I'm fine with all their change … Okay. So, they have a question about the last sentence added here requires two years between terms and attempt to clarify that a person can be appointed to a new term so long as two years will have passed between leaving and returning. Then they say, "Does this match our intentions? Alternatively, would the working group like to have a rule that two years will have passed before an individual is eligible to be considered for appointment?" So that means more than two years might elapse in practice.

So, basically, the question is can someone run for a new term prior to the expiration of two years, if that means they would be seated after two years has passed?

I think surely our intent was that they skip a term so that would in fact allow someone to serve two years, sit out, and then run for election before the expiration of two years, as long as they were not seated until two years has passed, right?

Does anyone feel like they should wait two full years before they run again?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's exactly what the recommendation is. So we are not changing anything I think here. Just clarifying the wording.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think their point was the difference between running and being seated. So, I think we were saying no less than two years will have passed before they're seated and that to me is what we meant would fit with the recommendation.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So, do you mean that they mention that it's okay for them running while the other … Like running for this role before … Maybe one year, then they run, because there is nothing for two years term.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, I think we're okay with what they've done. But just to make sure you're clear on the scenario, if my term completed, say, in June of 2020, I have to sit out two years. I can't serve again until November 2022. Elections typically are being held the previous spring. So, can I still run for that seat even though the two years have not elapsed? And I think we're okay with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I run in March. If running starts in March, then we're saying, well, that's fine, as long as you're not being seated until November '22.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT:	So, I think we're fine. It does match our intentions, so we're fine with our edits.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Yes.
TOM BARRETT:	Great. Okay. And then we have … Want to go back to the redline, Jean-Baptiste? We can see what other comments, unless you think we'll miss the comments.
	So, if we scroll down, look at the other redline edits. This redline at the bottom of page three actually I think s for me. It's not from legal. That was something they saw.
	So, in Section 8.8 … Again, this is where we moved down that comment that was up in the first section, so I think it's appropriate to have it here. So, in fact, it's okay to even be slightly redundant. So I have no problem with being redundant here.
	So, I'm fine with the language they put here. Anyone else have an issue with this?
	Then we can talk about the second comment which is separately we note that there is still pending a conversation with the community as to whether the unaffiliated status should be required across all NomCom appointees. If there is a possibility that the number of appointees impacted will be anything less than all, this section will need to be

rewritten as we could not leave that detail to an operating procedure document as it could create inconsistency with the bylaws.

So, I guess there's two points in here. Whether or not we need to address this unaffiliated on the possibility it's going to be less than all, and I think that was certainly … We wanted to leave that flexibility there. But secondly, the first point is whether we need to have this conversation with the community when that will take place.

So, let's take that latter comment about the conversation with the community. I guess we were hoping that the bylaw change would be basically—address that. But it sounds like they feel like we need to do something in addition. Any thoughts or comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My immediate reaction was where did we say we're going to be required to do that? Then I figured, oh, well, maybe it's somewhere and we'll hear about it when you tell us, Tom. But I didn't find it … I was more, "We do? Really?" Any bylaw [inaudible] to go through this, plenty of opportunity for public comment. But it's just my reaction. I might have been tired and cranky at the time.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Maybe we can bring up the recommendation. It does talk about confirming the community desire for unaffiliated directors and how many there should be. We certainly have adjusted that as part of our implementation plan and we need to … If that's the case, we need to

make sure that's communicated so people don't go back to the IE report and say, "Well, the IE report says this. How come it wasn't done?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But it's not the IE report that counts. It's what detailed implementation planning says.

TOM BARRETT: Correct. So, can we bring up the implementation plan for I think it's recommendation 27, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'm on it.

TOM BARRETT: While Jean-Baptiste is bringing that up, the second point is whether or not we need to be specific in these bylaw changes about whether or not it applies to all NomCom appointees or if a NomCom can have the flexibility to decide [it's less than all.] So the question is, does that need to be in the bylaws or could we put that into the operating procedures? Which is what I thought we were hoping to do.

So scroll up a bit and just read the headline of the recommendation. Recommendation, provide clarity on desire for and definition of independent or unaffiliated directors. Upon clarification of desire and definition, determine the number of specific seats of unaffiliated

directors. That's basically the recommendation, so that wording itself doesn't mandate how we—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's in section two.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's part two of the tasks, NomCom to reach out to the ICANN community. in the questions we put out, did we not do some of this when we put out the questions?

TOM BARRETT: I don't think we did, in terms of the outreach.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That was an oversight then.

TOM BARRETT: So yes, the question is, we could certainly do this now, we can kick it off for January, a public comment. And there's probably a few other recommendations that we might want to include in this public outreach period.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we're going to do some outreach, we could pop it in. Tom, I just remember having conversations where we were actually using [Avri and CIRA] as the examples, and that's exactly where we would have been having these decisions about the all or some.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's not clear to me that we haven't done this conversation. In my mind, we got some feedback at the list from the shares of some ... and from the board. I don't know. But certainly in my mind, we did that. But anyway, we need to prove that we have done.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So we'll see if we can't provide documentation on having doner this. Frankly, I don't think we have. So if I'm right, then either we change this detailed plan to take it out, or we go ahead and do the outreach. So assuming I'm right—humor me for a second—and we have not done an adequate work to satisfy step two, should we either do it or we change it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Doing it albeit in a low-key way, which as you realize is going to be my suggestion, bundled in with a whole lot of other stuff, is easier than changing it in fact, because changing this does mean it has to be specifically pulled out and the change rationalized and justified to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, which to me seems a whole lot more work than throwing it in if we've got some other stuff to do some outreach with as well.

TOM BARRETT: Agreed

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I agree with Cheryl too.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, so let's plan in Q1 to make this part of an outreach effort to the community. I think there are a few other recommendations we should include with that as well. So as part of the document we send off to the OEC for our bylaw changes, we'll certainly update it to reflect the fact that we're also conducting this outreach during this bylaw update process. Hopefully it won't—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, the other thing is I think there's probably an advantage now we have this modified and firmed up language, having gone through the quick rinse cycle and sanity check by Legal. Now we have some language that is able to be referenced in such an outreach. So I'm not sure we've put the cart before the horse necessarily anyway.

TOM BARRETT: Great. Okay. So we'll take care of that. And it may delay the OEC starting their process, so the sooner we get that done, the better, probably. So we'll plan that for January. All right, so back to the redline. I think that was really the last comment or question from ICANN Legal

that we need to talk about. Scroll down, is there any other redlines? That's it. All right.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I think there's just one minor ... So here in red, you had mentioned that you don't think this is needed. I just wanted to flag that they concur with that.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So even before you get to the red, they talk about the added ... So you notice here that as you know, we have a transition for which SOACs serve one year before they get to the full two-year cycles. So ICANN Legal is suggesting that at the end of the bylaws—I think it's section 27 of the bylaws—that we describe in that transition section how we would transition to the two-year terms. So that's obviously a great idea, so all the details we went through can go there.

and then subject to the details and the approved Nominating Committee ... Yeah, I don't think we need this comment. I guess that was my—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I think the only reason that I would pause on the removal of it is we do use that term later on when we talk about vacancies, etc. We have used that subject to the details in language elsewhere. And I guess I wonder what's the harm in having it there, but I'm not going to die in a ditch about removing it.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Actually, Cheryl, I agree. Let's leave it in because it does flag to readers that there's more detail somewhere else. So I'm fine if we're leaving it in as well. Anything else, Jean-Baptiste, that we should talk about?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'll check, Tom, but I think you have addressed those.

TOM BARRETT: I guess what's missing here is what section 27 might look like.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. But I think we gave them all that detail, so it shouldn't be controversial. But certainly, I think ... Whatever we give to the OEC, we should include that transition article as part of the redline we give to the OEC. So I guess we could draft that out if ICANN Legal hasn't done it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes.

TOM BARRETT: All right.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So just two other things I wanted to mention. More as a general comment. For transparency purposes, they invited the with g to continue highlighting any updates or modifications to implementation steps. Also, if there are more questions, they're more than willing to schedule a call to answer any questions you may have on their comments, and also, the last thing is that they are reviewing the standing committee charter and they will share that soon. So where there are any questions, they are more than happy to have a meeting with you.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. So on that first point, continue highlighting in any document publicly available any updates and modifications. So we have obviously our Wiki. For example, we've changed some of the dates. I assume we're publishing those changes to the Wiki so that if people want to know what changes we made last week, they could find them. Or if we haven't, I hope we do.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: What I did until now is, for example, those were flagged in the first progress report, and the second one I'm working on is that I flag what are the steps that are modified. But if that's not enough, then yes, another possibility is to highlight that on the Wiki.

TOM BARRETT: All right. I'm fine with waiting to do that in the year-end report rather than do it in two places, if anyone else feels like we need to be more transparent.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I'm happy to leave it like that. That's fine.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. I think we're done with this agenda item, we can move on. So we did talk about these recommendations last week. I know that Theresa had volunteered to follow up on some of these. I don't know if you have an update yet, Theresa, if we want to wait until the next meeting.

TERESA ELIAS: Good morning, everyone. Yes, if you'll look, Jean-Baptiste has added some notes down at the bottom of this slide, right below recommendation 12, and you'll see that Göran has definitely said that himself or one of his designees will be addressing the topics. What we need to do now is prepare questions and share with them in order to schedule meetings regarding these two recommendations, and then they will appropriately assign them to the proper SMEs, and then we can move forward and schedule the meetings.

What we need to also decide is whether or not we want to schedule two separate calls to address these two recommendations or make it one call and discuss them at the same time.

TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Teresa. I would suggest two separate calls. One with Göran, one with Finance, so that I guess working backwards, that would be my suggestion. In terms of the questions, I suggest we do this on the list so we can probably get that done in the next week or two and get the off and schedule something in December or later. So thank you for that.
TERESA ELIAS:	Welcome.
TOM BARRETT:	All right, any other thoughts or comments on this? So we'll do this on the list. I can do the first draft just to get things started, see if we can't finish this in a week or so.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Tom, would you like to have some Google docs prepared so that everyone can add their questions there?
TOM BARRETT:	That would be great, Jean-Baptiste.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Will do so. Thank you.
TOM BARRETT:	Thanks. Thumbs up from Cheryl. All right, next agenda item. So as you know, we've already done a fair amount of outreach regarding the

bylaw updates for the rebalancing and to change the bylaws to facilitate rebalancing specifically the GNSO members to the NomCom. It's come to my attention that there's a deadline coming up for the ATRT3 final report, I believe December 1st, and there's a section there that talks about both a continuous improvement approach but also a holistic assessment of the future of reviews within ICANN.

So the Commercial Stakeholder Group is planning to respond to that section and link it to the NomCom review final review that talks about doing a holistic assessment as part of the rebalancing exercise.

I think what I see happening here in terms of the debate on our recommendation 10 is somewhat of a contradiction about doing these holistic assessments versus continuous improvement, and they are, I think, contradictory. You either are trying to review everything, big bang approach, or you're looking for small improvements. Any my sense certainly was that the community was backing off from doing these holistic assessments and trying to go to a continuous improvement methodology, but I think that may not get full consensus in the community.

So I know this is coming. Any thoughts about whether or not we should even provide a response to the ATRT3 knowing this is going to be part of the other comment submitted? I know Cheryl, I've put you on the spot. What do you think?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I'm happy to be put on the spot, and you've got Vanda here as well. I don't think we should put any comment in at all. We fully expect the

bleating noise which is a continual and sustained misinformation, deliberate mishearing and misreading of what ATRT3's recommendations are in terms of the periodic holistic review as per our plan, holistic being all of ICANN as opposed to the component parts of ICANN, with the particular focus of the continuous improvement going on and being encouraged in-between these periodic all of ICANN—read that as holistic—reviews being conducted within each of the SOs and ACs.

And if that sounded like something I've said before, it is because I have said it so any times to people who continually—including several ATRT3 members—fail to understand what the majority and consensus view of the recommendation supporting ATRT3's recommendations actually meant. Does that give you a hint, Tom?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: May I add something?

TOM BARRETT: Sure, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, what is interesting is that the ICANN Org is for a long time trying to improve and they set up excellence on management process. What we have proposed on the ATRT3 with this continuous improvement and holistic review is exactly excellence manage process. So I don't know why we have one process running in the ICANN administration part of this community and could not do the same for the community itself.

So this for me is so clear that we need to improve the way we work all the time and get things done when we discover something wrong, then instead of wait for periodic review five years later and stick with this wrong solution for so many times instead of fix it. So I don't know why. The only sensation, feeling that I have is that they who is not agreeing maybe understand that they should do a lot of work they're not prepared to. But it's not true. The review process that we have in our hands for instance takes a lot of work, much more than if you have improvements all the time and then when you have a big review and get together with the others, you have so less work to do than to wait for those times that we are used to.

So let's see what we got from feedback, but that's my view, that I cannot see why people are not comparing the progress inside the Org and see how we can follow same path. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. So that's well said, as Cheryl says. And so obviously, we're assuming that the board appreciates that distinction because I can tell you that this group is very active in trying to resist our bylaw change and tying it to this concept of doing a holistic assessment first. Again, we could go back to our narrative that we're submitting and make sure it very clearly makes the point that we don't think that's the right approach here.

All right, so we will—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Regardless, I don't think we as an entity need to put in a comment to ATRT3 final report.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, Cheryl. Good point. So we'll just go back to that narrative, make sure it's crystal clear. And obviously, we may even have the benefit of seeing some of the responses that come in.

All right, I just want to raise that. So next agenda item—by the way, the next meeting, we're not meeting next week. The meetings in December will be focusing on our end-year report, and so as part of that, I did want to—and some of this can be done on the list as well—is make sure that each of the recommendations, we are clear about what the deliverables are for the recommendation.

As you recall, in the implementation plan, there was a section called metrics, which is basically, how do you know if you've successfully implemented the recommendation? And I think that that may not have lent itself well to actually defining what the work product was going to be coming out of the recommendation. So this is an example for 27. The metrics to measure successful implementation, the ICANN community under the working group lead has been provided clarity on desire for and definition of NomCom unaffiliated directors and a determination has been made about the number of seats of NomCom appointees to the ICANN Board for NomCom unaffiliated directors

. So that's what we put down as a metrics. In reality, our work product are revised bylaw changes. So in this particular case, the output of this recommendation will be a revised set of bylaws and perhaps even a

revised NomCom operating procedure. So that's an example of ... And then of course, if there's an ongoing supervision of ... Do we mean all appointees or is there a way to make an exception to that? And when is that exception allowed? That would also have to be language we add to the operating procedures.

So my point here is that in order to declare victory on this, I think it would be worthwhile to also identify what we have in terms of documentation when we're done with this recommendation. So I guess I'm suggesting adding an additional section to all these recommendations that just talk about work products.

There were some others that I think are more clear cut where we actually do have a work product but it's not spelled out as very explicitly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, is there any need for an additional section, or can we not add them to the metrics? So have any viable work products specified where we know they will be able to be produced in the relative metrics box. It's just the difference between putting it in that box as opposed to creating a new line, I know, but I'm not sure which—

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, that's fine, I think that works, Cheryl. I just feel like some of these recommendations are not particularly ... Not the one we're seeing on the screen here, but some of them, I think, are silent. I think it would be worthwhile to know when we're actually done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if it is silent and it's meant to be silent and there isn't going to be something, that's okay too, but we should probably have that in the box and say "Not applicable for this." Because not everything will have ... In ours it does, but in others of these thrill packed and exciting exercises I've gone through, there have been the occasional recommendation where the metrics box is blank and that's okay. But happy to add the work products where they will exist.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. So I see two types ... I'm fine with adding into the metrics box. I think there are two potential things to add. One is what I'll call work product, what documentation will be produced, and then secondly is what I'll call process. And my idea behind this is, when do we hand off a recommendation to the supervision of the standing committee? Or an interim standing committee.

So I think that's also what I want to make sure we identify when the work of this working group is done for a particular recommendation and when the standing committee takes over. So maybe we can just step through some of the ... If we go back to the first recommendation, I know we don't have much time, but we can ... So we'll walk through at a high level what I'm talking about and maybe we can do some of this on the list as well.

So obviously, this has to do with job descriptions. According to this, the metrics here, updated job descriptions are drafted, distributed to the bodies appointing members to the NomCom and used in subsequent

selection processes by these bodies, and two, finalizing the implementation in time for the selection of the 2021 NomCom members.

So obviously, what's unsaid here is that the job descriptions will be published somewhere on the NomCom website so there's transparency to the community, and in terms of being used in subsequent selection processes as part of the operating procedures, it should be clear in terms of a timeline when those job descriptions need to be distributed, reviewed, published, etc.

So I would say work products include things like there's a timeline published somewhere describing how this process is going to happen, and of course, that's part of the operating procedures. So we don't need to go through detail, but that's what I'm trying to add in here. So for example, when is the work of this working group done? It clearly isn't going to ... It should be done at some point and a standing committee will start managing it from that going forward. I don't know if that helps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure it did help, Tom. Sorry. I thought I was with you for a while and then one of us wandered off.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, let's go back up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, please, because I would have thought adding in the reference to the additional work product of the process for this ... bullet point one should lead to the regularization of that activity being part of the standing operating procedures. And that to me is the addition of the work product that we just supported. So I'd see that as an additional thing in that box. But then you lost me.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, so the question is, for this review working group, when are we done with this recommendation? When do we declare victory and say we've finished this recommendation?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: We have to go back to our checklist where the process are, and we check whether we can do it, or according to the charter of the standing committee, they can do it. And then we start checking boxes and then we have to kind of audit our work again going through all this timeline, the checkbox, what we achieved and what's remaining.

    That's the only way I can envision we doing that. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you, Nadira.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Following on from Nadira, I would have seen that point in time as once we got up to point 11 in the box immediately above the metrics with

relationship to the 2021 NomCom members. and from then on, it goes over to whatever version of the standing committee, first interim and then—

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Did my connection disappear?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, we heard you, I believe.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead, Nadira.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I'm not hearing anything.

TOM BARRETT: Oh, I'm sorry. Did you have something to add, Nadira?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: No, I talked about a process that we can do. That's the only thing we can do.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So you can see the steps above, which talks about ... if you scroll up a little bit, Jean-Baptiste ... There you go. Yeah, so we have step one,

compile a timetable or timeline. Step two, find out if they have a job description. Three, ask leadership what content they would add. Four, ask NomCom support staff what they would add. Five, create an overview document. So surely, there's some things here we can still do, ask for a review of summary documents from HR professionals, support ICANN Org to draft proposed job descriptions for NomCom members,, and presumably, this is happening in the current NomCom cycle. Provide a draft document to the bodies and appoint members, ask for feedback.

And again, we've done some outreach already asking for feedback form the appointing bodies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Didn't we get all of that done?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, so we have job descriptions. Just bear with me, Cheryl. So ten, post the job descriptions on ICANN Org. so we haven't done ten yet, correct? We don't have a website where these have been posted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The 2021 NomCom does.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So here, Tom, I think we stopped at step eight.

TOM BARRETT: So we're up to eight. No, I agree, Cheryl. So the question is, what do we have left to do? If the 2021 NomCom has it, what do we have left to do then?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Then we fulfilled our second bullet point already. What we have to do is probably note that by our specified point eight, it was taken up by the 2021 Nominating Committee and it'll be going forward.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sometimes, these steps, when we put them together, apart from being verbose in some cases, so detailed that ... You see what I mean? You're wanting to know when to declare victory. I would say we already have, and if you want to do anything, we note in the report that there was a transition across at point eight.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So you'd say in the year-end report that we have finished this recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As far as we need to to meet those metrics, because we can't do anything more for the 2021 NomCom members. The selection ... it's done. Finalize all of this in time for the selection of ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, it's too late.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. So we don't meet for another two weeks. What I'd like to do is go through a Google doc and I'll review the 27 and invite everyone else to do the same to see if we feel like the metrics capture the output of this as well as ... I just want to make sure we know when we're done [inaudible] recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we have those situations, Tom, we can make the annotations and such annotations such as the example you've given where we can draw a line under eight and it's handed on and will now be ... The addition of the work product, in other words, enshrining it into the SOPs. Once that is added in, then I think we can tie a bow on it. But that's where your proposal for the addition of a work product is critical.

TOM BARRETT: Right, so that would be 11. Okay. We're at the top of the hour. Any Other Business before we get to the schedule, or any other comments? All right. So we are going to do some things off list. we're going to draft questions for those two other recommendations, 11 and 12, and also just take a review of all the recommendations to see if we have to adjust any dates or metrics for the yearend report.

EN

Again, we're not meeting next week, we're taking the week off, and in our schedule, we have three meetings in December before we finish up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay.

TOM BARRETT: With a goal to get a yearend report by December 17th.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Sound good plan.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, everyone. Have a good day.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Have a good Thanksgiving for all that celebrate it. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]