JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hello everyone and welcome to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group meeting 74 on the 8th of April, 2021 at 19:00 UTC. I will quickly do a roll call. Today, we have from the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group, Tom Barrett, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Nadira Al Araj, Raymond Mamattah. I would like to note that we have apologies from Leah Symekher. And from ICANN Org we have Yvette Guigneaux, Pamela Smith, Betsy Andrews, Kristy Buckley, Larisa Gurnick, Teresa Elias and myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez. I will now ask you whether you have any statement of interests updates. Seeing none, I will pass the microphone over to Tom to run through today's agenda. And just for the record, I would like to note that Dave Kissondoyal has joined the recording. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste and welcome back everyone from our month-long hiatus. So, we have some catch up today of various open items that we've asked ICANN Org of. So, the agenda here seems extensive but I think a lot of these items I think are fairly quick. So, prep week webinar debriefing, process diagram, job description, candidate assessment, annual reports, request on recruiting source of candidates and marketing plan, key diversity categories and of course the next meeting. So, in terms of the prep week webinar debriefing, so Cheryl and I gave a great presentation to a fairly large crowd, I thought. So, as you can see here, 77 attendees including seven of the Working Group and 29 from ICANN Org. We took some feedback, temperature taking questions that I think were well received. Among the other people who attended, any

other takeaways you had from that webinar? I guess I'm not looking at hands been raised here.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: There are none at the moment, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Surely one of my takeaways and we'd probably had discussed this in two or three meetings prior was—and we mentioned this during that webinar that our really primary deliverable for the mid-year report would be to have a new version of a NomCom operating procedures submitted for review and for various reasons which we should talk about in a second. That was certainly one takeaway that I remember from that webinar. All right. Unless there's any other questions, we'll move to the next agenda item.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom, as you know, I was not on the webinar but I listened to the recording. So, here as well I just wanted to mention, you mentioned the number of attendees, just wanted to add that, I don't know if you saw but there as well several OEC members that were present. And as you know, we are also supporting their work and we expect that the OEC will initiate a dialogue with the Working Group as a follow-up, I guess on the webinar. One question I had to the Working Group is whether you have suggested improvements for future webinars and whether you found that the temperature questions, like the use of that was helpful and whether this should be conducted in the future. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hi, everyone.

TOM BARRETT: Hi, Vanda.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: How are you?

TOM BARRETT: Good. So, Jean-Baptiste, I think that certainly—what we call the temperature questions is definitely a good thing to continue for future webinars. It's always good to get the pulse of who's attending and so yeah, I think that was good. In terms of suggested improvements for future webinars, I don't know if you folks have any suggestions. Nothing comes to the top of mind for me right now.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I believe it was very good and the exchange between you and the Cheryl, even that she had a voice problem, etc., was quite nice without any position that not allowing the participants to feel comfort to make questions or something like that. So, I believe it was very good.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. ICANN staff, do you have any suggestions that come to mind that maybe we could try next time?

LARISA GURNICK: Hello everybody. Nothing in particular comes to mind other than the things that were already discussed. I think it was a useful presentation. Thank you. And as Jean-Baptiste said, in terms of follow-up, we know that the members of the OEC are interested and keen to have a dialogue with all of you as follow-up to the presentation and the semi-annual report so thank you for that.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Larisa.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I just wanted to read out Cheryl's comment in the chat saying that we should certainly keep [in] some temperature taking questions.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. So, in terms of the feedback from the OEC, do you have an idea of what the timeframe would be for that?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, we're trying to get that situated pretty quickly now that everybody's back from ICANN70 and we're hoping that to make this easier for all of you, we would just use your regularly scheduled weekly calls for that

purpose. So give us another couple of days to work through this but we expect something in short order.

TOM BARRETT: Great. Thanks Larisa. Just curious, would that feedback also incorporate any feedback from ICANN Legal or should we anticipate ICANN Legal coming back separately in terms of the charter and the bylaw changes?

LARISA GURNICK: We anticipate coming back to you with ICANN Org responses on various things including, I know there was request to have a dialogue with Göran and various other things. So, those will probably happen after the conversation with the OEC so we're just dealing with the administrative logistics now.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, great. All right. Shall we move on to the next agenda item? So, process diagram.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Tom. I can take it from here if you want.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, if you recall on one of our last meetings, there was a request from the Working Group for us to liaise with the NomCom support staff to review the [lucid] chart that was developed for the NomCom annual process and ask whether there are any milestones on that chart that they believe are missing. So, we had that conversation and I'll just share the updated version. Just one second. Let's see. Can you see the chart? It's a bit small right now, I will make it bigger.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, we can see it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right. Just one second. Let's see. And as well because it might be too small for some of you, Yvette has just shared the link in the chat. So, what I wanted to mention first to note the steps that are listed now. So, those are considered the vital steps describing the NomCom annual process. So, this is not reflective of potential process changes resulting from the implementation. And here the updates that were made are shown in pink. So starting in November on the left side, so you see before it was simply labeled as job description. So, this was renamed as a call for job descriptions from selecting bodies. The other one that was added is the one on top between March and May which is regarding the [inaudible] [bias] interview training and governance training. You can see here that this one is not linked to any other steps. That's because it's a standalone task. It stands out by itself. There are no dependencies.

Later on in the process, so from May to September, the deep dive candidates step was added for the month of May followed by the due

diligence taking place between May and June. So, after that, there were no changes to the two that you see here, final interviews for Board candidates and make final selection. And then inform successful candidates was there but it was shown a bit later in the year and this has been moved to June and July, if I recall correctly before I think it appeared in September. And same for announce final selection, it has been moved earlier in the process to August, September as the announcements needs to be made two months before the AGM.

And finally, the candidate survey was as well advanced and moved to August and September. And as I expressed earlier, the process map that you currently see is not reflective of potential process changes that would result from the implementation. So, as a consequence, the two steps that were previously at the beginning and the DNS, the new leadership meets with the standing committee and stuff and the one which was reporting and debrief with standing committee have been taken out of the process map for now.

TOM BARRETT:　　　　　　Great. This is a great update. Let me ask you, that first pink box, November, call for job descriptions from selecting bodies. When you say selecting bodies, are those bodies sending NomCom members or bodies receiving NomCom appointees? Just to clarify that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:　　It sounds to me like it should be receiving bodies, is it? This is the job descriptions that the NomCom are going to operate on.

TOM BARRETT: Well, I'm trying to clarify that. It says selecting bodies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it does. I see what it says, I'm suggesting it's a typo.

TERESA ELIAS: It's the job descriptions for the open leadership position. Sorry.

TOM BARRETT: Okay, perfect. So, yeah, that probably should be receiving bodies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's receiving bodies, yeah.

TOM BARRETT: Thank you. All right. Excellent. So, is it fair to say then that this is a process map of the 2020, `21 NomCom? Would you agree with that, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom, can you hear me?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry. I have a bit of background noise. Can you please repeat that?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. This is the current process map for the NomCom, yes?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, that's correct.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. And so, our goal, obviously, I think, our goal is to figure out what the future process map looks like after we implement all our recommendations, right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, I think as a result of the implementation of the Working Group recommendations there should be other steps added to this one.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Okay. But this is, I think, very helpful. It's a great baseline process map basically of what NomCom does today, so I think that's great.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Again, this is really a snapshot of what are considered to be the vital steps in the process.

TOM BARRETT: Right. Okay. Yeah. No, I get it. Like the NomCom timeline, it needs to be fairly high level so it can be digested fairly quickly. So, I guess the question I have for ICANN staff and the other folks here is, does this satisfy rec 13 requirement or do we want to—is this just a baseline process map and then we have to come up with the future process map for rec 13?

LARISA GURNICK: Let me jump in. Some of my colleagues may have also a [view] so apologies if I cut anybody off. In our view, this is a useful starting point for the way things are working currently. So, for the current process, this is the way it works. And the thought was that this as a baseline would then get updated based on the implementation and the changes as they take place and become implemented officially or whatever the case might be. So, the thought is that it becomes a document as so many others where they're revised on a periodic basis based on changes that happen for a variety of reasons but certainly because of the implementation work. So, that would be our thinking and it could be done potentially later in the process after some of the recommendations have been fully implemented. But also happy to hear other views.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. Thanks, Larisa. Any other thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Can I just jump in? I was trying to [inaudible] this time, Tom. I thought rec 13 asked us to do a data [collection] exercise. In that case, this satisfies that part of the recommendation that [we've done a data capture exercise.] And then that becomes the foundation, as Larisa has just described, on a living document which is updated and modified both by us in our implementation work and ongoing into the future. That was my take on all of rec 13, that the data [capture part I believe probably fits the bill].
TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah, I think Nadira agrees with you as well. So, I think this is a good, as I said, a good baseline process map. We're not quite completed with this recommendation yet but we're certainly halfway there. Jean-Baptiste?
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	No, Tom, I just wanted to ask you before we move on whether you would like me to update the first pink edits just to reflect what you mentioned before, like to reflect that it's from receiving bodies.
TOM BARRETT:	Yes. I should say receiving bodies.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Yep. All right.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, some part of my takeaway, I mean, I think this is great to have as our baseline but I think that all this is somewhere in, you would hope, in the current operating procedures. I'm not sure they are actually. Some of this stuff might not be discussed in the current operating procedures. For example, there's nothing in the operating—well, I won't go box by box. So, but what I had spent time doing the past month was going through the operating procedures and starting to flag what is not discussed. And what struck me about the operating procedures is that they're really focused on—the audience of those procedures are the NomCom members themselves. It describes what their job is as a NomCom member. So, it's obviously tailored for that particular need and does that job well.

So, what it omits are all the other processes that are done, say, elsewhere in ICANN Org in support of the NomCom. And, I think eventually we want to somehow reference those in our process map as well. But it becomes a very busy process map which is why we've tried to break it up into multiple process maps. But I think before we even get to that point, we need to agree on what the next version of the operating procedures are going to look like. First of all, we want to make sure that this process map is reflected in the operating procedures and so that is one exercise. And then we have to figure out what else we want to add beyond this baseline into the operating procedures. So, I'm interested in thoughts from anybody about taking those as our next steps. Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS: Tom, I know you're calling this a baseline. I want to go back to the note from Jean-Baptiste at the bottom of the document that describes it as showing all of the vital steps that have to happen in order for the application and selection process to be successful. And I just want to make sure that trying to combine the procedures document into the process maps, will get so far into the weeds that it's going to make the mapping unreadable. That's just my two cents.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I agree Teresa. I agree. Absolutely. Which is why I thought there might be multiple process maps, right? If we really want to define, for example, how does the NomCom interact with the receiving bodies, some of that gets into the weeds which we're not capturing here, right? We're not capturing the fact that there's some back and forth in terms of whether or not they're happy with appointed candidates. And so, I think that gets into the weeds and we don't want to show everything on our main process map but that could be a side process map that just talks about those types of interactions. So, what are the thoughts about having multiple process maps? [Inaudible] talking about here are the essential steps and then the other one that talks about more discrete, detailed processes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure the engineers would love it.

TOM BARRETT: Is that for our benefit, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Multiple process maps. I can watch paint dry on a wall and be more excited, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: I'm not offended. I have two engineering degrees but I won't get offended.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know that's why I said, I'm sure the engineers would love it. A process map is a vital tool but it's a tool, not the whole toolbox. References out of the process map or even one or two process maps that go then do appropriately formatted text, sure. That works. I mean, I once sat down with a paper napkin and worked with Bruce Tonkin on a very important letter. So, I do understand how we need to be pen, paper and boxes and flow diagrams sometimes. But it's not the only tool that people in NomComs going forward and in the wider community need to use. It's an important tool, but it's not the panacea. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. And I have hands from Larisa and Teresa. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Let's have Teresa go first and I'll go after her. Thank you.

TERESA ELIAS:	So, I think Tom, I think if you put out more than—this is just my opinion. I think if you try to break out the procedures document into process maps, that's going to get confusing and too many process—I think I sort of align myself with Cheryl where a process map should indicate the major steps that are required to make something successful. Whereas then you have the document itself which then details what happens under those vital steps. Because if you try to do a process map for every step like Cheryl, you're going to have your walls tiled. I mean, it's going to be new wallpaper. And people aren't going to look at it and in my personal opinion, it is not a good use of time, especially since we already have a procedures document that's created where you can go back and if we want to add more stuff to it, edit, make it better, that's fine and then we take the vital steps from that procedures document and go back to the process map and make sure there are no vital steps missing from the master process map. But I think doing multiple process maps for the procedures document is going to get massive. It's just going to be too massive. You're going to have—I can't even imagine how many process maps you're going to have.
TOM BARRETT:	Thanks, Teresa.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Vanda.
TOM BARRETT:	Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: May I, Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe Teresa is right. I don't believe that we need more than is stated here to understand what is needed to be done. If you start to put more and more and more information, maybe in the end, nobody wants to go to the NomCom because we'll look so confused and so overworked that people will try not to join the NomCom because looks like I will never be okay with that. I will spend all my time just reading that. So, I believe it is quite clear. For me, the only thing that we need in the separate map should be the standing committee process. Just that. This one that I'm in NomCom now and it is quite clear what we are doing now. So, we are doing and there is no much that we need to explain for any member that what you should do then. When you go into this point, the information you receive about candidates, etc., will be inside that action, that task, not for the general information about the process. So I believe it's done, it's clear and it's very understandable and readable for the outsiders. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:	Thank you, Tom. The advantage of going last is that pretty much everything I was going to say has already been said, so I'll be brief. I think that this discussion is really helpful because the recommendation is about publishing a process to codify key elements of the NomCom process. So, it sounds like we have that well reflected now in the process map. And thank you, Vanda for your observations as a participant in the NomCom because speaking on behalf of my colleagues from the NomCom operations team, they certainly strive to facilitate and support the process in such a way that every step is clear. So, if between the process map and other guidance and documentation processes that are made available, make it clear for the delegates, what they need to do. And if we have outwardly facing materials that make it clear for the community, what the process is at a higher level, then it seems to me that we have accomplished the goal of the recommendation. Thank you.
TOM BARRETT:	Thanks Larisa. Anyone else? All right. So, I see support from Dave and Nadira. So, it sounds like we're happy in terms of rec 13, we have a baseline process map. We may need some updates based on some of the recommendations but we're not going to do multiple process maps. We have just the one. Yes. So, my suggestion is that we do turn to the operating procedures to see if they reflect this process map and see what might be missing from the operating procedures. New hand, Teresa?

TERESA ELIAS:

Yes, Tom. Dave had a really good idea and I put it in the chat. He said, you know, talked about using hyperlinks. And I think a great way to find out if there are any vital steps missing would be attaching hyperlinks to the steps in the process map that would then, if you clicked on it, it would take you to that specific spot in the process and procedure document so that you don't have to go searching back and forth, right? You could click on something and it would take you to that item in the procedures document. That's just an idea. I don't know if it can be done. That would be something that the NomCom support staff would need to buy-in on and see what sort of work that would take.

TOM BARRETT:

Well, I think it's a great idea because certainly if we can't find a place to link to, that perhaps points to something missing from the procedures. That'd be a good way to verify that. So, back to, I guess, what we said at the top of the hour, our goal—my goal and I think this is—I haven't heard anyone disagree is for the mid-year report that we submit to the OEC, we'd like to have a revised document of the NomCom operating procedures. So, it should reflect not only this process map in full but any other recommendations in the review that we want to capture in the operating procedures, including whatever the standing committee might be doing to help coordinate things. Any thoughts, comments, objections to that approach? So, I'd mentioned—yeah, go ahead, JeanBaptiste. You said there might be some feedback that we should wait on before we start that exercise? What are your thoughts on that?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Vanda, I see that your hand is raised but I think it's an old hand. Yes, what I replied to in our discussion before the call is, just wanted to remind you that there was a request that was submitted to ICANN Org on mapping. I just need to find my notes again. Yes. On the mapping of—

TOM BARRETT: Matching recommendations.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, exactly. Like for us to assemble the mapping of recommendations to the relevant operating procedures, and it's why we had suggested that we first work on doing that. But maybe just to have a better sense of the objective that you shared to have the operating procedures updated before the next progress report, I just wanted to be sure, what would be the main objective and the outcome that you expect from this?

TOM BARRETT: So, what do I expect to come out of this? So, there are several things—basically the review itself in terms of an outcome should be reflected in the operating procedures. So, you think about—we'll just go down a short list. One of the changes is that there's going to be a more strict change control over the operating procedures so that the standing committee will look at what's being proposed to be changed, decide if it's material enough to go to the community for comment, etc. So, that's a fairly substantial change to how the operating procedures have been handled in the past. I think that there are different interactions that in

terms of conducting surveys and feedback, continuous improvement that are not captured in the operating procedures. So, essentially what I'm thinking is whatever the standing committee is planning to do, there should be something in the operating procedures to reflect what the standing committee is doing, right? In a way, we have a standing committee charter but they shouldn't be working on things that are not mentioned as part of the NomCom operating procedures. To me, that seems like there's a disconnect. So, that's what I was trying to synchronize, is what's the standing committee anticipating doing, well there certainly should be something in the NomCom operating procedures that addresses it. What are your thoughts on that, JeanBaptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Well, thank you for clarifying, Tom. I mean, this thing makes sense but again, what I shared with you earlier is that like not to miss any step, what I would encourage is maybe to wait that we have received feedback on the charter so that at least we can start from the final version and process this update.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. So, so as long as we can meet our mid-year deadline, I'm fine with that. It comes to back to how soon that feedback is forthcoming, right?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah. I understand.

TOM BARRETT: Now, for example, we have a recommendation that there's more involvement from the NomCom and the NomCom standing committee about the budget process. That's not really addressed in the operating procedures. So, I think there should be a section in the operating procedures about addressing budget requests. So, the operating procedures serve a particular purpose today which is what a NomCom member needs to do, the typical NomCom member doesn't think about the budget process so that's why it's not mentioned, right? The typical NomCom member doesn't think about the process with appointing bodies and making sure they publish job descriptions and making sure they run timely elections. So, it's not addressed in the operating procedures but it should be addressed because that's part of the NomCom. So, feedback from the charter, I don't think it's going to change the fact that there's still a process for getting members appointed to the NomCom that should be described in the operating procedures. And I don't know if any feedback would materially change that process. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, Tom. Two things. On the questions around the budget, we are planning to schedule an opportunity for your group to have a discussion with Göran so that he can provide some insights into a number of things that I think were questions that the Working Group has had on how things work. Budget is one of those. There is a process. It's an internal process in terms of how it's managed within the Org. And then of course it's part of the more transparent annual planning and the budgeting process. That's already part of the much broader exercise that happens—managed by our planning team but in any case. So, there is a

process in place already that I think might be useful for you all to hear how it works and the rationale behind it which will happen as we agreed to get that scheduled. And that might inform your understanding of how things work and we could certainly look at updating the documentation to reflect some of those things. But the suggestion is just to do that when these questions and answers are further along and the understanding is further along as to what should change and what is already currently in place so that we don't end up making lots of changes to the operating procedures unnecessarily. So, the suggestion is just to do that when all the pieces are more clear, if that's all right.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. No, I understand. But the question is, will we have a final answer by that by, I guess, in a month, right? It's already April 8th, month from now is May 9th, month after that is June 9th and we're preparing our mid-year report. So, I think we could start revising the operating procedures. So, for example, there's a whole section about external consultants, right? Training, recruitment, assessment and I'm sure we'll get feedback from ICANN Org about how those processes should work but we certainly can identify that should be a section in the operating procedures that the NomCom needs to handle. So, the bigger question is, do we want that kind of stuff in the operating procedures or not, right? They're not there now, are you suggesting they don't need to be there or we don't have the final process defined for all that stuff so we should wait until that's been finalized? There are new hands so I'll go with Teresa first and then Larisa. Go ahead.

TERESA ELIAS: Thanks, Tom. Listen, taking, for example, the selection of consultants, the reason that that's not detailed in the procedures manual and here again, I'll go into quoting the—it's too much in the weeds but it's a vital process that needs to happen. But if we had to give you step-by-step of everything that we do in order to decide what recruiters we're going to get, what steps we take to make those decisions, how many calls we make, how many times we talk to the recruiters, what happens after we talk to the recruiters, what happens after we agree what they're going to do? I mean, there's so many steps, again, and I think that would be too far into the weeds whereas the vital discussion with the leadership or the delegate committee has to happen as to what do they want the recruiters to do. We go out, we look for the recruiters—I'm just giving you big points. We go out, look for the recruiters, we give the leadership choice of recruiters. It's a weedy process. And I think as long as you know that step is in there and it has to happen, that's what needs to be known. Now, I'm not really sure how far into detail you want to take this because the more we add, the bigger it gets. So, just throwing that out there.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Teresa. I know Cheryl's on the list. But real quick so, I guess the question is, do we mention it at all the operating procedures or do we stay silent? Should there be a section of the operating procedures talking about the NomCom's processes with their external consultants? The question shouldn't even be in there? I won't answer. I'll go to Cheryl next to see if anyone else wants to respond to that. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. Okay. So, in answer to your question, first of all, I don't actually think it's a NomCom operational procedure matter. I think it's a leadership of the NomCom and they certainly need to be more deeply involved but I don't think rank and file of the NomCom need to be involved, engaged or unless they're incredibly nosy and they can ask, want to know the details. They just need to get on with their job which is not this minutiae at all. Making the magic happen, however, is vitally important. And to pick up on Teresa's point, how I think of these things is the difference between what our business processes and the operational processes for any given NomCom and the consistency that we want to see in that. So, what I would keep in the operational procedures for a NomCom should be predominantly about their work, their processes and what they need to do. They need to have some knowledge about the overall stuff and that's why things in flowcharts exist at that higher level. But in terms of the business process, it's the same as setting a standard for a procurement to be made and then someone in the business of procurement making sure that standard is met and nothing more. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. And just as a follow-up to that point before we get to Vanda. So, what document should talk about those business processes? You're saying let's not put it in the operating procedures?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Org's business. They've got procurement requirements. They've got standard operational procedures for those business aspects. If

somebody on the leadership want to know about it, then they go to the Org and find out [inaudible] NomCom support staff.

TOM BARRETT: No, you're saying we don't have any document that describes those processes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we do as part of the organization but they don't in terms of Nominating Committee [insert here] operational procedures needing it.

TOM BARRETT: Right. So, does the standing committee have a document that describes those business processes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The standing committee may not need a document if it has a wide, basic knowledge. And if they have been leaders and have been engaged more closely with staff in these business processes and discussing the standards and criteria relating to what happens in the weeds, then they don't need it written down, do they? So word of mouth instead of knowledge. But if you want to have the guidelines for the ongoing group to chronicle it, sure, but that's not the operational procedures for the NomCom.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. I do think it needs to be written down. So, I think this is what institutional memory is talking to. If it's only in people's heads, then people move on and people have to relearn it or reinvent it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. As I said, but that's not operational procedures for the NomCom. That's the standing committee.

TOM BARRETT: Fair enough. So, that's my question. So, where do we write down these business processes if it's not in the operating—?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We don't. A standing committee should. We can suggest that a standing committee should.

TOM BARRETT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And these are not carved in stone, these are living documents because guess what? Things change.

TOM BARRETT: Yep. All right. So, you're saying the standing committee should write down these business processes. I'll move on. Vanda then Larisa.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just back to your question, just an example about the external consultants. This time in the NomCom, we had sections to select it and do a listing to the proposals and to select between two proposals that the Org have organized for us and so, and they choose the consultants. So, that was in this time part of this internal process of the whole NomCom. But I don't believe it's necessary to put in here because the selection process is something that will come as Org organize that and there is a question if we want or not want these external consultant. And then they make some, go look for some proposals and present those proposals to us. If you see necessary to put this item this time, this item was under our process. But I do believe that what we have discussed before, it was for the standing committee to analyze and see what is the best solutions for the NomCom if the results from the previous one was good or not. Those are keeping the historic process in hand. So, I believe it belongs to the standing committee to be in their process. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Vanda. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: I'll be quick because I'm sure you're ready to move on. So, I think the intent was to make sure that institutional knowledge was captured but also so that there would be a standard process that wouldn't be reinvented every year with the nature of the NomCom being reformed or formed every year. So, with that in mind, it seems that some of the

recommendations that ask for things like, for example, clear criteria for selecting the vendor as an example, so that wouldn't change from time to time and that could be something that the standing committee could ensure. But the actual process of procuring and contracting with the provider, that is that process itself is pretty well-documented internally within ICANN Org and I think maybe to a certain extent there is public processes also available for what are the steps in the procurement process that ICANN Org goes to procure any vendor. So, there's some due diligence and some—a variety of steps. So, I think in some cases, it may be documented elsewhere and the idea is just to make sure that the work of the NomCom and the NomComs from year to year follows some predictable process and is consistent from year to year and the process be documented somewhere but wouldn't necessarily have to be documented in the NomCom process operating standards or procedures. Seems like that would be confusing. Hope that helps.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Larisa. Yeah, that helps. So, what I'm hearing is, let's not put them in the operating procedures. At a high level, the business processes should certainly be captured in the standing committee, which I think they are. And again, perhaps there's more feedback forthcoming about ICANN Org about if there's agreement that their charter is the right scope. Let's move on to the next agenda item. If we could, we have about seven minutes. Go ahead, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right. Can you see the slides?

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Process diagram.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. So, moving on to the next item which is the job description status and that reflects what we show on the diagram, meaning that right now this time of the year, this is the time when NomCom operation staff send a request to the SO/ACs to select a NomCom delegate. And if you recall, the working group had drafted a job description. So the job description that was drafted reflected, well, some of the outcome of recommendations with, for example, like the terms, etc. And so, there was a suggestion to use the job description and already launch it. So, there would be a first phase for this year where basically we would modify the job description to reflect the current bylaws considering the implementation is not yet finalized. And then once finalized, then the job description would be revised again. And what we did just to put that more into—so that you have an overview—Yvette, if you can share the link as well, we have made edits on the job description that was drafted just to reflect the current bylaws. And so, if you agree with that approach, then that would mean that's—so basically that the work that was done could already be [inaudible] the current process. I know we are limited in time, but yes.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks. Thanks Jean-Baptiste. And so, this revision doesn't reflect our proposed bylaw changes but it does reflect some of our review, is what you're saying?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, Tom. Once again, I'm sorry, I have a lot of noise. Can you hear me?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, we can hear you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, sorry. I did not catch your question because of the noise. Can you please repeat?

TOM BARRETT: This still, for example, talks about voting delegates serving one year terms, right? So, we've obviously our recommendations have moved to two-year terms.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's correct, Tom. So, this would only be like until implementation has been finalized so that would be used at the—what was developed as a job description would already be used but it would still reflect the current bylaws. And as soon as implementation is complete on the recommendations affecting the job description, then that would be updated and used afterwards.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Great. Yeah, so that [inaudible].

EN

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Would that be okay?

TOM BARRETT: That sounds good. Yep.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, perfect. Thank you very much. I'm mindful of time. There are three more minutes. Let's see. Back on the slides. Would you like me to go quickly through the various updates?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, please.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right. So, on recommendation 21, so there was a request to schedule a discussion with HR to find out if they could suggest some assessment tools. So, here I don't think this was mentioned before. So, there was a [inaudible] note to the group as of 2020 and then after the final report was published, one subcommittee of the NomCom, the assessment subcommittee developed an assessment tool to score candidates on the report competencies to fulfill the open leadership positions. And this is also something that was used later on with the winnowing process. So, this is like an update that we wanted to mention that there is in fact already an assessment tool being used. So, one question was as well whether we would feel need to reach out to HR to get more information on assessment tools or whether we would consider this information and move on.

EN

TOM BARRETT: This was developed by NomCom rank and file themselves as opposed to ICANN Org?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I believe so but if it's not the case, if you can correct.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Certainly, I think this would be helpful for us to see and we've always talked about standing committee, for example, starting to build institutional memory. This is a type of tool that we'd want to start adding to the institutional memory so that next year's NomCom could have access to it and improve on it. So, I think this is good to have.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom, just so you know, I got confirmation that it was the subcommittee that created this tool.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The next update we have as well was regarding the request to confirm whether publishing annual reports is a standard practice. When was the last time a report to be published? So, really quickly, the general report is published at the discretion of the NomCom chair and is not mandated

by the bylaws. However, it could be included in the operating procedures and best practices. And here you have as well some information as to when were the last annual reports published. I know we are already at the top of the hour. So, I have one minor, last update but we can do that at the next call as well.

TOM BARRETT:　　　　　　　Why don't you finish up. Just keep going.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:　All right. So, this update is regarding your request to obtain statistics on conversion from viewing job description. So, here we just wanted to confirm that currently there are two types of campaigns. One is organic so meaning NomCom delegates doing their outreach. The second one are paid campaigns. So, for example, like LinkedIn, everything that is using medias to reach out to potential applicants. And the second thing I wanted to mention too, is that there are improvements to surveys being envisioned and NomCom staff is looking into clarifying details on the details that you're looking for. So, for example, how did an applicant found out about the application process? So, this is it in terms of updates, yes. And then the other topic is something that takes more time. So, if that's okay with you, Tom, I will move to AOB and next meeting.

TOM BARRETT:　　　　　　　Yep. That would be great.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right. So, is there any other business, and if none, our next meeting is next week at 19:00 UTC.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks everybody. Talk to you next week.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you. Have a nice weekend.

TOM BARRETT: Bye-bye.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]