

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Welcome, everybody, to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group, Meeting #62 on December 3, 2020 at 19:00 UTC. I will quickly do the roll call and pass the microphone to Tom to go through the agenda.

On the call today, we have Tom Barrett, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Vanda Scartezini from the working group. From ICANN Org, we have Yvette Guigneaux, Pamela Smith, Betsy Andrews, Jia-Juh Kimoto, Teresa Elias, and myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez. We have no apologies for today's call.

I will quickly ask whether there any updates to your Statement of Interest. If that is the case, please raise your hand. And just for the record, we have also Nadira who has just joined the call. All right. Seeing no updates to your Statement of Interest, I will pass on the microphone to Tom to go through the agenda. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. The agenda today, we want to review the feedback from ICANN Legal. I did have a chance to review these and suggest some revisions, so we'll discuss those as well. We'll go over Recommendations 11 and 12. And again, the idea here is to develop questions for ICANN Org. And then four, if we get to it, discuss our year-end report but also I know that we're going to see if Jia had some feedback on earlier question that I'd like to get to as well.

So why don't we get started with the feedback from ICANN Legal regarding the Standing Committee Charter. As I say, I've already

---

*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.*

---

reviewed these and suggested some edits. So, for example, right off the bat, they suggest not using an acronym because it's easily confused with other acronyms. So that's been removed throughout the document. I also, per their suggestion, removed our footnote that defined continuous improvement and just rely on the ATRT3 to define that.

Raise your hand if you do have questions. I'm going to just move through these until I get to some juicy parts.

After removing the footnote, they suggested removing the word "optimal," which I think is fine. And then there are three bullets here that refer to provide continuity across annual NomCom cycles, build the institutional memory of the NomCom, and help coordinate communications through the NomCom and other bodies. The feedback was that it seems ambiguous, and so what I did here as a suggestion to that was I made a small word choice change and a third bullet help coordinate processes and communications between the NomCom and other bodies.

Then in the next section, I repeated these three bullets and just add another explanatory sentence. As you recall, this Section 3 really talks about all the different third parties that the NomCom interacts with really directly addresses the third bullet above, so I thought I'd just repeat again these three bullets, provide continuity, build the institutional memory, and then three is really a segue into the rest of this section.

Real quickly, in Section 1, I simply described continuity. Several of the NomCom processes span the typical timeframe of an annual NomCom

---

cycle. With the transition to new leadership and members, this can lead to inefficiencies. It probably needs another sentence or two. And then two, build the institutional memory of the NomCom. The Standing Committee will establish and maintain a published archive of NomCom work products. This will include updating any changes or additions generated by each NomCom after redacting any sensitive information contained in the documents. You'll recall, further up, I took out that sensitive information item in the initial bullet in the previous sections. I'm just moving it down, down below.

So I'll pause there for a second. It probably needs more here. If there's anyone here from staff who helped provide this feedback, maybe you can provide some more color as well. So I'll pause, see if there's any comments or feedback on these changes. Okay. So we'll keep moving on.

I do think I probably need another sentence under Section 1 here, and perhaps Section 2, but if we scroll down a bit more, as I said, the rest of this section really applies directly to bullet three coordinating. So I've expanded bullet three, it's not just communications but its processes and communications.

Then the other general comment or feedback is, as you recall, the first draft of this, we were doing a lot of coordination. Then we thought, "Well, gee, we don't actually want to do all the work or imply we're doing other work. So let's come back and change that to "oversee". So that's, based on the feedback, is still perhaps not the right word still with that everywhere. So I went through here and made some additional edits changing the word "oversee" to either "coordinate" or

---

---

“ensure”. Again, I’d love to get some feedback if we’re hitting the right tone here. So, for example, if you scroll back up, Jean-Baptiste, instead of “Oversee the processes of continuous improvement,” I’m simply saying, “Coordinate the processes of continuous improvement.” I took out the one-time exceptions and made it its own bullet down below. Assess one-time exception to the operating procedures and determine the level of community outreach and awareness that is warranted by the exceptions. I guess I have to insert the word “that”. That is warranted by the exceptions. To coordinate instead of oversee the process of assessing the recommendations published in the annual report.

Three, I’ve added another bullet. Coordinate updates to the overall process maps generated by the NomCom review. Three, I left “oversee” in place here. Again, scrubbing—I think there were two of this comment—and after they’ve been scrubbed of all identifying and personal information. And then the last one again, there was a comment or feedback about what’s meant by extraordinary budget requests. So simply expanding on this by saying that we’re not included in the approved NomCom budget.

I’ll pause there for a run through these. The rest of the edits are basically in line with this. So, Cheryl, I see your comment. I see Teresa’s comment. Oh, good. Yeah, I agree. They’re all good, friendly amendments. And again, we might have to go through a few more iterations to get the right tone.

So Section 2, again changing the word “oversee” with “ensure” that the process is followed with the ICANN Board on the job descriptions and

---

annual appointments. Again, we're not overseeing that process. We just want to make sure it's followed. So that's basically the tenor of these edits.

Again, throw something in the chat or raise your hand if you want to comment on these. Should we scroll down some more?

In Section 4, just changing the word "oversee" to ensure that the process is followed. Same with number five, changing the word oversee to ensure the process is followed. I see a comment, Vanda. Number six, again, just ensure the process is followed as opposed to overseeing the process. Keep scrolling down. Keep going. And the word external consultants. Number eight, again, trying to explain what's meant by institutional memory, which means by maintaining a historical archive and change control process for processes and procedures used by the NomCom.

And then I added that the fourth bullet here actually was in a later part of this document, and the feedback was it belongs perhaps somewhere else. So I put in here published regular reports regarding the goals and accomplishments of its continuous improvement program. Again, that was just at the end under metrics.

Okay. There are a few more comments that you want to get to. Number four here, composition. Feedback here was four members as selected from a public expression of interest process. So the feedback I think it's two-fold here. One is who does the selection? So I've added in the comment by current members. But then there's also a comment or feedback that is how do we address concerns that were self-

---

perpetuating and not fully accountable? I may be butchering the feedback. Does anybody have any thoughts about A, if we have the right process on how to select members? Should it be someone else or someone else participating? And B, based on that, this proposed process, how do we ensure that we make the Standing Committee accountable to the ICANN community? So I will pause there and wait for a hand to be raised. ICANN staff, feel free to go weigh in as well if you have any suggestions on this as well. Anybody?

Okay. Scroll down. When we scroll down, go to where we actually see the feedback. Keep going.

There was some feedback about non-performing members may be removed by a majority vote of the committee, and the question is how do you define non-performing? I put in a suggestion here. This may not be the only criteria, but any member who fails to attend at least 66% of scheduled meetings will be considered non-performing and subject to possible removal. Anyone want to argue with that percentage or criteria? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No. I'm not planning on arguing with the concept or the percentage. But I was wondering what the Nominating Committees in recent times have used, noting that non-performance of a few members, luckily, has been a reoccurring, if not perennial issue, in Nominating Committees for even before I was involved with any of them. So there has always been a quiet word between the leadership and a person who is simply not meeting the requirements. And only on one occasion am I aware of did

---

the chair of a Nominating Committee directly approached the chair of the appointing body that had sent that member and had asked him to be withdrawn. So these things are not new, but I am wondering what type of criteria.

For example, one thing I would always suggest is a degree of discretion from the leadership. For example, you may all met, one you've proposed there, Tom, failed to meet 66% of scheduled meetings even though you've been sending apologies to those meetings, but might in fact be doing a huge amount of offline work and managing a lion's share of the other assessment and contributories. I mean, attending in a meeting and in doing absolutely nothing in the meeting could be a lot less valuable than not attending a meeting and doing valuable work. I just want to make sure that there's a smart metrics, not just singularly-focused ones. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah, I'm fine with not defining non-performing. So I just threw this out here to spark some discussion. We don't actually need to define it if we want to provide flexibility on this. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. What I see is not a need to define because we will never review all the bad behaviors that may occur during one year of work or two years of work. So, in my opinion, it's for the members among them to reach out and decide who is going to be finding what reason. When I need to do that as a chair in NomCom, I went to the Legal staff to help me to define if I could do that. And our group in the NomCom decided to

---

remove the person for bad performing, but each bad performing is completely different from the others. So I'm in favor to just leave that for the committee to decide. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Vanda. I know there was a more recent case of someone being removed, not so much because of performance but because of other issues. So it's maybe something that we can't come up with a definitive list of criteria. So should we have anything in here at all as examples of non-performance, or do you want to leave it blank?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I prefer to leave it blank.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I agree with Vanda. If I'm going to say anything, I would suggest as clearly articulated by the Nominating Committee and its leadership team at the time. Because what is important is that the rationale is given and that it is clearly articulated. It may not be clearly articulated publicly, it might be clearly articulated merely in a file with Legal, or in correspondence between the appointing body and the chair of the Nominating Committee at the time. But it does need to be in some way, shape, or form justified because, of course, it can also be brought up for review and complaint, if someone doesn't believe their removal or encouraged resignation is a valid exercise. So it's just a matter of making sure Nominating Committee and its leadership team is working smart about such a thing.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl and Vanda. Going back to the earlier question about, have we considered any accountability concerns in the Standing Committee's ability to select and perpetuate its own membership? Any thoughts on how to react to that concern?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda here.

TOM BARRETT: Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The hand is not going. I do believe that we have no historical background to see if we're going to have people interested in that or not, it will depend a lot on the first performance of the Standing Committee. So after that, maybe there will be a lot of people that can go. But I'm not against to remain and if the people is well-performer—because it's not an operational issue. It's just a Standing Committee for some kind of—like a board. Some boards are open to people to be there for life. I don't know. My view is this kind of Standing Committee is not a committee for anyone. It's something that needs to have experience in time and the difference of the others is so attractive for general community. So I'm not against. I can accept other ideas, but I'm not against. Thank you.

---

TOM BARRETT:

Thank you, Vanda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm happy to support Vanda, but I'm also happy to have some sort of hybrid model. I think in this type of thing, having some stability and some sage-like wisdom, as I put in the chat, is important. I would be highly surprised if this Standing Committee became some sort of desirable appointment. It's an acquired taste to be passionate about Nominating Committee activities at the best of time. So as a subset of a fairly thankless task, I would think that there's hardly going to be clamoring at the gates. That being said, assuming that we did not have a number of people wanting to step forward and serve in this position, I'm also very aware that there's constantly, for some particular reason in particular in volunteer organizations, a bunch of people who will put themselves forward, whether they have the criteria or not and whether or not they have the necessary skillsets, experienced or not. And sometimes having a annual event of renewal wastes hell a lot of time in the administration of all of these, "Oh, I'd like to do that because it might look good on my CV for some obscure and peculiar reason," people who then need to be called because they don't have the skillsets and criteria anyway. So I think we need to be cautious about the desirability of ensuring refreshment and current thinking and having fossilization occurring. But I think there's a middle ground there somewhere that we could look at. From time to time or not necessarily annual rotation is a way of getting to that. And perhaps we need to think a little further on how we look at that and have that clearly articulated in an operational procedure. But my personal preference is the hybrid way forward. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. [Kaye] asked a follow-up question to that. We do talk about there are term limits. We do talk about preference being given to prior experience on a NomCom leadership team, applicants endorsed by an SO/AC. We try to have some diversity on incoming members who are not from the same SO/AC as outgoing members. What hybrid would you suggest, or what language?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. All of those criteria are fine. What I do know is if you look at the amount of even just list traffic on anything, anywhere, certainly in most volunteer organizations but also in ICANN, anytime you have the word "election" or "selection," people come out of the woodwork, identify now why that obviously they're wanting to go to the opening of an envelope in their board. I don't know. But anyway, whatever it is, there is an awful amount of energy put into dealing with those activities in a fair, frank, and still fearless manner, whether or not they do all meet the criteria or not. So an annual expenditure of that sort of energy can be taxing. You can spend more time leading up to the Expressions of Interest, working through them, dealing with them publicly result in them, and going on. And then you're practically back into the cycle again. So sometimes having not an annual cycle can allow a little bit of breathing room and still ensure that you get churned and refreshed. Because that's what you want, a mix of stability and sage-like wisdom, and churned and refreshed. Okay?

---

TOM BARRETT: I'll just point out that we do have membership staggered so that one member rolls off each year, and every third year two members roll off and replaced by two new members. So we deliberately did put in an annual EOI process, I guess. Did I interrupt somebody?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: This is Nadira.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead, Nadira.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I was going to support what Vanda and Cheryl about—especially this role of the Standing Committee. As Cheryl and Vanda mentioned, it needs the wisdom and the stability. I'm following up to what we put on the criteria, we will be having the associate chair, which will be rolling every year, I think. It's kind of the link on this committee with the NomCom themselves. So it is already included but maybe we can change the terms to give them longer time of staying. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you. Thanks, Nadira. Just one more follow-up question. What about the thought of the fact that the new members are selected by the existing members? Is there an alternative that appeals to people?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. As long as it's public, it's all about transparency as far as I'm concerned. This is a rarefied space. People need to understand what the roles are, what the responsibilities are, what the requirements are. The main thing is we need to put in bold letters across the top and there will be no travel support associated with this activity. And once we put those words in bold face in large capital letters, I think that will help call some that are clean and enthusiastic individuals. But I have no problem with as long as everything is utterly and absolutely transparent and the processes are clear that the old can work with a new, noting that the current leadership and linkage between the Standing Committee and the Nominating Committee is baked in, and that's what's important.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. Any other thoughts? If we scroll down a little bit more on the feedback, there was a question here I didn't quite understand. The feedback is, the members of the Standing Committee will select a convener at the ICANN at the annual meeting to lead the committee rotating each year. The feedback is, where is this defined? I don't know if they are talking about convener or the annual meeting terms of the question. For some reason I thought they were questioning the definition of annual meeting, but obviously I think they're perhaps questioning the word "convener," even though that's not highlighted here. What do people think?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If that's all they are after, there's plenty of good dictionary definitions of what a convener of a meeting is.

TOM BARRETT: I wasn't clear what they're asking here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's ask them, because it's certainly not clear.

TOM BARRETT: Is there any ambiguity about having an annual meeting? Are people talking about changing that concept of annual general meeting? Or is that always going to happen?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: This is—I'm sorry. Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. It's just I cannot understand what is not clear. Even for me it's clear.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yeah, for us it's clear because we put that I think because it's at the General Assembly, it's where the transition between the two, like the new appointment. So we need somebody from the Standing Committee as kind of capacity building introduction to newcomers—newcomer batch. That's why we put the convener to be with the NomCom at that time.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure you're quite right there in terms of capacity building role, etc. Convener of a meeting is a specific role, and it is a very similar but not exactly the same as what is frequently conducted in a chairmanship. And the orientation, as opposed to capacity building would be –

TOM BARRETT: I'm sorry, Cheryl. I was going to ask a question. Is anyone else within ICANN using the term convener?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's used in a couple of work parties and working groups throughout different ACs and SOs. It's not used often enough, in my view.

TOM BARRETT: I suspect that's the word they're probably asking about as opposed to the highlighted section.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, then we can do a footnote to the definition. We could simply define it as a footnote.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Why don't we do that? As Jean-Baptiste says in the chat, he'll confirm that's what they're raising as an issue. I suspect that's what they're asking. So we'll define that in a footnote, or just expand the role. I guess somewhere we should define what the role is of this person.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yeah. I think Cheryl mentioned it's a kind of orientation. If you use the word, that's what exactly what's the convener is. It's the role what used to be, not the chair, the associate chair, what sometimes does that. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I don't see the role of any individual doing the "orientation". Orientation or stepping up to the role here could be done in a bunch of ways. One thing that comes to mind is we are talking about people who have particular experience skillset. So, provision of orientation materials in an online and digital form is a very easy thing. We're not trying to tell these people how to spell at ICANN and what Nominating Committee does. They've served on them, they should know. So what they need to know is the specificity of what the Standing Committee does, to be honest, throwing them a copy of the Operational Procedures is all that needs to happen. The Standing Committee itself can make sure that occurs. But I put in at least one definition of convener from an English language perspective with some examples.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. So, I guess my concern is that we don't want this term to distract people from what the Standing Committee is trying to do, just like they got distracted by independent directors and other stuff, rebalancing. I guess it'd be nice to understand and get more concrete examples of whether or not ICANN is embracing this idea, or if we should just use something more conventional and move on.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So you want to have yet another chair?

TOM BARRETT: I don't. I just want to have –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's exactly the same, only people aspire to be chairs because it looks good, and a convener is less sought after. And I'm all for keeping it simple stupid on this one.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. That's probably huge, Cheryl. Because more people are going to ask the same question and now we have to add a footnote, we have to explain its role, because people aren't accustomed to it. I don't want this to be something totally –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you like chair, use chair. Go ahead, Tom. Run with the term you prefer. I prefer it to be a lower case C, if you do, as in a piece of furniture.

TOM BARRETT: That works. It looks like we're spelling convener wrong anyway.

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI:                    Anyway, just maybe they are not talking about the convener but about the General Assembly, because they normally use ICANN and now General Assembly.

TOM BARRETT:                        I thought it was AGM.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:                    Yeah.

TOM BARRETT:                        I didn't know they use General Assembly.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:                    Yeah. That is even in [inaudible].

TOM BARRETT:                        Okay. All right. So, Jean-Baptiste can confirm what that word should be.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:                    Yeah, whatever. Just so I remember because I'm seeing my husband here with the [inaudible] right in this.

TOM BARRETT:                        Thanks, Vanda. We will find out which one they're talking about. Please scroll down, number seven, they suggested moving this continuous

---

improvement part further up, which I did. So that's done. Scroll down some more.

So there is a comment here about what if this is changed pursuant to the ATRT3 recommendations? Should we set a cycle with it optimally happening during that review, but in that no less frequent with that every five or six years.

I just reorder this as a little bit—the thing that you see deleted here, it's just moved down below. So, any one of the ICANN SO/ACs, etc. may propose amendments to this charter so that that's just the opening sentence. And then I have this charter the Standing Committee shall be reviewed as part of the NomCom's organizational review per the Bylaws, but in any event, it shall occur at least every five years. Again, that needs some wordsmithing probably, but just to make it clear that we'd like it to happen, but maybe reviews aren't going to happen anymore so we still want to have some sort of review of the Standing Committee.

Again, their feedback was, is there any way to future proof this so that changes can be recommended by all these different entities? That's why I'm leading with why I moved it down. It may not quite address that feedback. Any thoughts or comments on this?

I think that's the end of the document. It's up on Google Docs. We'll do another iteration of this, but I think that was some great feedback from my ICANN Org. So hopefully this is getting better. Any final thoughts or comments on this before we go to the next agenda item?

---

All right. Let's move on to the next agenda item, which has to do with Recommendations 11 and 12. Just to remind you what these were, 11 had to do with the senior staff member supporting the NomCom should be accountable to and report to the Office of the CEO. And #12 was NomCom leadership should have input on the NomCom budget and staffing resources.

We were going to come up with some questions to start with #11. I guess the first question is, how you're in feels about this recommendation, how they might implement it, or if there's any sort of resistance to this recommendation. This is a Google Document that Jean-Baptiste circulated. I just cut and pasted the narrative from the final report here, why they're suggesting this change. The NomCom is highly dependent on ICANN staff support as concerned staff is under resourced, which has affected the functioning of the NomCom. You guys can read the rest of this on your own.

There's also concern raised about the lack of integration of the NomCom's staff members within the ICANN staff structure. So if you scroll down a bit, Jean-Baptiste, this recommendation in the nonprofit community, governance is the responsibility of the CEO and Nominating Committee staff functions are typically linked to the Office of the CEO, etc. So that's why they are suggesting this. Interestingly, there's also a sentence in here, "The NomCom senior staffer should undergo an annual review with the Office of the CEO. As a development function, the NomCom leadership should provide written developmental feedback each year to whomever the senior staffer reports to in the office of the CEO."

---

The question is, prior to meeting with Göran or his designate, what questions do we want to propose regarding this recommendation? So I put in to strawman in here, what is ICANN Org's response to this recommendation? Do they feel this is appropriate? Or if not, what department do they feel is appropriate for the NomCom staff to report to? Anyone have any reaction to that or other suggestions or edits?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda here.

TOM BARRETT: Go, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that NomCom staff is really not dependent on the hierarchy of order kind of staff because they are dedicated to a specific group that is in charge of selecting Board members. At least in my opinion, if it was a normal organization, certainly this committee will report to the vice president or something like that because it's quite important, the role that they need to make, the kind of secrecy and privacy of information they got. So it's some kind of demand that is quite peculiar when comparing with the other staff groups that can move from one group to another.

I haven't seen during those years group to change on a staff. The staff for NomCom needs to be quite informed about the NomCom process, NomCom path of confidentiality and all other issues that is demanding for this kind of staff. So they have really peculiar role. So in my point,

---

they should be assigned, really. Since at the beginning was first one, one person, then add someone, and then add someone. This person retired, then the second one just keep then. So I believe that that's the best way to keep those people and respond to some kind of side group in high level hierarchy inside the ICANN. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you, Vanda. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. I wholeheartedly support what Vanda had said. But I think what we need to recognize and so on, supportive of the first question but not so supportive of the second question, this proposal from the Independent Examiners was a result of not just deep thought but significant observations and particular analysis of how things work best in other types of entities. And this is how this type of setup works best in other types of entities. So I don't think it's a matter of saying what department would you like it to be. I think it's a matter of what does ICANN Org respond in terms of this recommendation and how are they going to implement it? Rather than what alternative, which I think the second is kind of leading to a watering down. That second question opens the opportunity for a discussion on the watering down of this recommendation. And I think this is a recommendation that needs to be firmly run to the letter. If anything, it ensures that a very critical activity, the Nominating Committee process, which is vital to the diversity and capabilities of not only the ICANN Board but other key parts of ICANN leadership has appropriately supported. And this is about supporting

---

staff and developing staff and making sure the key staff feels fully and properly integrated while still being able to act in its at arm's length and confidential manner. Anyway, that's me chapter and verse on it. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think both you and Vanda make good points. So, strike this second question and focus on trying to get feedback on how the Office of the CEO wants to implement this recommendation.

Again, this is a Google Doc, so feel free to think about that over the next few days. It's not ready yet to send anything off, but I'd like to see if we can't finalize these questions by the next meeting.

Can we go down to the next recommendation, which has to do with the budget? Again, this is a well-known problem with the NomCom. So this is now really a discussion with the financial department. My proposed strawman question is: what does ICANN Org recommend to be the form of mechanism for the NomCom leadership and Standing Committee to be included in the annual ICANN budget process? Anyone have any other questions they think we should be asking here? Nadira?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ:

Wouldn't be the Standing Committee which passes this budget from here to the other? Because there's not going to be a big variation of the budget allocated unless they want to use like the external recruiter and evaluator. That's only when it comes a difference in expenses.

---

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Nadira. Just one point. I think this recommendation was proposed before they came up with a recommendation for the Standing Committee. So the Standing Committee certainly in a way improved on this recommendation because, as honest on it, it really doesn't work. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. Yes, the Standing Committee makes a big difference to fixing some of the issues that this recommendation was trying to fix. This recommendation came from the continued bitching, moaning, and groaning from subsequent over many years leadership of Nominating Committee is going, "Boohoo. We don't know what the numbers are." And part of me goes tough, even though I was in that position once. I think it's important to recognize that community and even community leadership in ICANN are involved in the finance and budget aspects of ICANN's operations in very specific ways, and none of that is denied, of course, when it comes to the budget of the operations of the Nominating Committee either. But what tends to happen in other parts is that there is a clear and unambiguous opportunity for the Additional Budget Requests and that ABR type process and putting up specific requests for particular activities and projects. And that hasn't been managed in a very clever way or regularized way in the past. I think if that can get fixed, that will go a long way to meeting this need and in fact could be even articulated as the way that this recommendation could at least initially occur. So the involvement of the Standing Committee and the current Nominating Committee leadership in what would in other parts of ICANN be covered by specific project requests and ABR type things will go a long way to do that.

---

But the baseline budget stuff, which is what others have said, it is what it is what it is. In fact, if one budgets for the likelihood of the couple of potentially expensive line items like the use of external consultants, then that's fine because you don't have to spend the whole budget. You budget for what you think you're going to need to spend. And if you under spend, nobody's going to cry over that. Usually Göran celebrates over that. So, that's the sort of thing that is very much the core business of the staff and ICANN finance people managing that. There's a great deal of predictability in it and you can apply percentage increases related to other known factors globally, all of that sort of stuff, sort of macro stuff. And I don't think other than a vague and interesting awareness we need to stick our fingers anywhere near that pot. It doesn't happen in other parts of ICANN so it does not need to happen here either. But what does happen should happen and that's the Additional Budget Request and specific project requests. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. We've talked a lot about process map. So I think that the Standing Committee should have its own process map that includes the budget as part of that to make sure that it has visibility within ICANN Org, they need to be in a loop.

All right, we're going move to Other Business. Jia, we're calling you. You can give us some feedback on the job description process.

JIA-JUH KIMOTO:

Sure. Hi. I just wanted to give a brief update and I wanted to have clarification on Recommendation 15, which is having the NomCom

---

publish a detailed job description for SO/AC and PTI Board positions. Basically, I'm working with other ICANN staff support from each group on the skillset and criteria, and I thought it'd be a good opportunity to see if there was an existing job description that they currently have so that they can add it to the current skillset and criteria document for the NomCom website.

However, I wanted to have this question for the working group to see if you'd be able to provide guidance with this effort. I just wanted to know what information is missing from the current document and is there a certain format that is needed. So I just want to work with the ICANN staff support teams to be clear on what is missing from the current document and what needs to be added to the job descriptions.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Jia. I'll put myself into the queue. I can't talk to what might be missing from the job descriptions, but it's more of a process issue in the sense that the NomCom I think historically has not really taken in, say, Board advice on what the Board is looking for, and then published a document that then was served as guiding principles for the rest of the NomCom process, meaning this is what the recruitment consultant was provided in terms of who they should be recruiting. This was how the assessment process selection criteria was followed, etc. So I think the idea behind this recommendation is that the job description, which is published at the start of the process to the community, which means if anyone has advice such as the Board or other receiving bodies, they need to get that advice in before the NomCom starts its process. That's key. If the NomCom wants to go beyond that advice and include other

---

requirements, that's obviously their prerogative and also is published prior to it starting its process, and then it becomes guiding principles for that particular cycle. The job description becomes the guiding principles for each opening that the NomCom is trying to fill. So that's kind of my two cents worth on why this recommendation exists. Does anyone else want to provide input or feedback to Jia?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda here.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that the final reports should also compare what was done, how the people select is really fit into the requirements or if not, why not. These kinds of things, I believe, is important for transparency and accountability to the community about the NomCom work if done or not done, and why. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. That's a great point. That's an important part of this recommendation is to help build the accountability and transparency of what the NomCom is doing. In my year, one of the receiving bodies was pretty unhappy, thinking their advice had not been followed. So they should follow these guiding principles, and if they're not going to, that

---

needs to be transparent. Any other thoughts? I don't know if that helps, Jia.

JIA-JUH KIMOTO: That helps. Yes.

TOM BARRETT: Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: Tom, I just wanted to let you know that when staff decided to put this effort together, when Jia and I were talking about putting this plan together, once Jia started reaching out to the supporting groups, the other ICANN supporting groups, there's a lot of positive feedback and all the other groups are really actually quite glad that this effort has started to go as deep as the NomCom staff is working on.

TOM BARRETT: Excellent. Thanks for that, Teresa. I think following this process, in terms of what our role is, we're not really trying to write the job description. We just want to make sure that the process is followed. And hopefully these process maps will get into that level of detail as well, because it's great to hear that the community likes the idea as well.

All right. We're at the top of the hour. Any other business before we talk about next meeting and the plan for the rest of the month?

---

Today is December 3, so we have two more calls this month. Jean-Baptiste did circulate a proposed draft of our year-end report so I expect we'll spend the next two meetings discussing that. But please take a look at it off list and it is a Google Doc, so feel free to propose edits or add comments so that we can get this done by the end of the month.

There's a question here about January 2021 call schedule. Looking ahead, it would be January—go ahead, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I guess it's just foreseeing the future and asking whether you would follow the same cadence in January and was written sent invitations already. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: I'm fine with this cadence. Does anyone else want to propose any changes? Is that a new hand, Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: Sorry. No.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. All right. So we'll go with the same cadence, January 7, 14, 21, 28, every Thursday. All right. That's good, guys. Thanks for a great call. It's very productive.

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Thanks all.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]