

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much. Hello, and welcome, everyone, to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group meeting #77 on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April 2021 at 19:00 UTC.

I will quickly do a roll call and ask whether you have any Statements of Interest updates. So starting with the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group members in attendance today, we have Tom Barrett, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dave Kissoondoyal, Leah Symekher, and I believe that's it at the moment. From ICANN Org, we have Yvette Guigneaux, Betsy Andrews, Chantelle Doerksen, Kristy Buckley, Larisa Gurnick, Teresa Elias, and myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez. For the record, we also have Nadira Al Araj from the working group who has just joined. Yvette, I'm going to ask you whether there any apologies for today?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: We have apologies from Vanda.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: We have apologies from Vanda? Okay. Thank you very much. So we have apologies from Vanda Scartezini.

I will now ask whether you have any updates to your Statement of Interest. If that is the case, please raise your hand. All right. Seeing none, I will pass the microphone over to Tom to go through today's agenda. Thank you.

---

*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.*

---

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. And before I started on the agenda, I do want to mention Leah is making a move next week to ICANN Org, so congratulations, Leah. This is becoming like an ICANN meeting that a few of us are privileged to attend. So this is Leah's meeting as part of the working group. So we appreciate all your participation over the last year or two.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Thank you. Thank you, Tom, and thank you, everybody. This has been a great learning experience and contributing experience and a long one from the NARALO side and the NomCom side and ISOC side. So I'm pretty excited to join ICANN Org and contribute in that capacity as well. I will be with the Contractual Compliance team. So I'm pretty excited to start that journey. Thank you all and I continue to wish you all the best with this particular working group. It's amazing work that we've done. As we all know, very vital, even with just what was shared in the OEC meeting last week. So I'll be supporting you all through. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Leah. So the agenda today, we'll do a debrief from our discussion last week with the OEC and get some initial observations from ICANN Org to summarize some next steps there, and then talk about perhaps changing the cadence of our meetings, and again our mid-year update to the OEC.

So let's start with the debrief from our meeting last week with the OEC. As you recall, there are three main topics we talked about: the rebalancing recommendation, the Standing Committee

---

recommendation, and of course the independent unaffiliated director recommendation, among others. I'll just speak, make one point then open it up to the floor. So certainly, on the rebalancing recommendation, I think that it was very productive in the sense that the Board has been hearing from the opposition this recommendation and we're under the impression that this is the full-blown rebalancing of the NomCom. So I think they were certainly pleasantly surprised that we are simply facilitating a future rebalancing exercise and not doing rebalancing exercise itself. So I'll stop there and see who else would like to chime in with their takeaways.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Tom, just briefly. I totally agree with you. At one point, I was concerned about the degree of preparation or homework done by one or so of our Board members, but I was relieved to see that it was probably exactly as you had now indicated and that was a response to squeaky wheels. So I think that it was good to clear the air. Of course, nothing we said had not been written down and said before but that's okay. Repetition is a good teaching tool.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. So my other takeaway, actually, I admit I don't think I was prepared for this question. I realized some of you chimed in on the chat. But the question about the level of support that we're getting from the ICANN community for some of these Bylaws changes, the unaffiliated director, for example, the Standing Committee itself, and I think I was slow to point out that our exercise wasn't to get support

---

from the community but to implement the recommendations. So I guess I left the meeting thinking that there is a sense from the OEC that we're supposed to be gauging support for these recommendations as opposed to simply implementing what they've already approved. I'm wondering if anyone else got that sense and if you think we should do anything about it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm going back to the concerns I had with that potential lack of homework, but that's all right. I think by the end of the meeting, we probably made that point clear enough. It would concern me greatly if all members of the OEC didn't understand what the specificity of each of our roles was. After all, I manage the process and I don't think that's the case. So I don't think it's a widely held or overly concerning belief. However, that being said, let's make it abundantly and blatantly clear in very simple language, very obviously, right at the front of our next report of what we're doing and why we're doing it and where public input comes into play on what recommendations actually are versus our role of implementing recommendations approved.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. ICANN Org staff, do you have some takeaways as well? Do you look at this differently or do you feel like we should be following up in some other areas? Sorry for the background noise.

---

LARISA GURNICK: Tom, I see that Leah has her hand up. And I'm happy to talk but suggest that maybe the members of the working group have a discussion first on all items, and I'm happy to come in after that.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Larisa. Leah, go ahead.

LEAH SYMEKHER: I believe what maybe would help—to Cheryl's point—is to be able to note down or summarize or maybe have a summary of whatever engagement we have with the community. I know they're asking for some kind of statistical, maybe an analysis of how we are gauging, how successful we are with the community engagement and how they're supporting what we're doing or not. So I think being able to have that more, maybe even have a section of just community involvement feedback, and maybe have our own analysis and show the support or lack thereof would maybe help them in terms of feedback from our meeting last time, and also moving forward. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Leah. And just to respond to that real quickly. Again, I don't think it's our job to get community support, necessarily. We're implementing recommendations approved by the Board. You can quibble with how we're doing implementation but the recommendations are what they are, so I certainly don't feel like we should be trying to defend whether or not we're getting support or not.

---

LEAH SYMEKHER:                    Yeah. I correct myself on that.

TOM BARRETT:                    Okay. Surely I want to do outreach as much as we can but I'll leave it at that. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:        I was just going to say to Leah, I'm very big—let's face it on transparency and accountability—that that to that end, we have always reported what we've done. But do we need to spend our time creating statistics, which I'm sure we can do, to convince who or what because it isn't our job to do that. I don't mean get the statistics, I mean to do the garnering of and give measurables for community support for recommendations made. That happens in the previous project two years back. So our own outreach and engagement, of course, needs to be reported, but we also shouldn't be outreaching and engaging beyond what our implementation planning calls for. We're not out on the hustings to change hearts, minds, and souls. If we interact with community at all, it is for transparency's sake, to keep them generally updated, and to where appropriate and as we have had in our agreed plan required to get certain interactions or support. There's a number of points in our implementation where that is articulated and, of course, that has to be done. That, indeed, is reported upon as it happens.

There was a little bit of muddying the waters there but that's okay. We muddle through. And providing we're probably giving more details and making less assumptions on fall and unfettered understanding by our readers, then in our next reporting we should be able to make sure

---

that's all right. One thing that might be worthwhile, Tom, is we did say on at least one of those pleas for metrics that we would gather some of the material that exists within our files or put it in an easily tabulated form. That's and action item we probably need to make sure we pick up on and make sure goes into the June meeting. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Cheryl. I see Nadira agrees with you, the community outreach is not our task.

Another item I'll bring up which is again the idea that we had an IE report now three years ago, two years ago, and as we went through the feasibility phase and implementation planning phase, we made tweaks to the IE recommendation. And so, at one point, a member of the OEC even mentioned, "You must have ICANN Legal look at this to make sure it doesn't conflict with California law." I thought we've done a good job explaining this is not independent directors as defined by California law. That's why we renamed it. But the issue came up again so it bears re-emphasizing, I guess, again in the mid-year report that we don't need to address that particular issue because that's not what the recommendation is aiming to do. But I also did get the sense or getting the sense that perhaps ICANN Legal might want another bite at the apple, so to speak, to review our charter and give us feedback on the charter. And again, I'll let ICANN staff let us know if they're planning to do that. Any other comments?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry to just jump in again, but I wasn't so sure that it was necessarily ICANN Legal wanting to have another bite at cherries. There's also clear places where ICANN Legal are again going to be deeply involved in the normal process that goes on regardless of whoever or whatever part of the organization is doing, you know, Bylaw revision, Bylaw reviews. There's a whole lot of really important activities with them that is just a normal part of the good part of the process. But I just thought it was a question to say, have we taken any advice from ICANN Legal, and the answer was yes. I'm not sure that it's necessarily Legal wanting to have another bite of the cherry, as you said it, but I think we obviously need to make sure, as we have been—and thank you in particular, Jean-Baptiste, for doing this—that we've been closely working with Legal, where appropriate, and there are other appropriate points as we go forward.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Leah, is that another hand?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah. I think Cheryl just summarized it at the end. Again, they did talk about Legal quite a bit, I think, and just wanted to make sure that we are engaging them and that we continue to engage them, just like Cheryl said at the end there. So it's something that we should probably continue as we've been doing. Thank you.



---

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Leah. I see Larisa put a comment in the chat saying Legal has not had the opportunity to review the unaffiliated/independent item in detail. So I guess we need to discuss why we are associated, unaffiliated with independent. I thought we kind of decoupled the two, but what are your thoughts on that, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Tom. My suggestion as next steps on that particular item, it might be helpful to have a conversation with someone from our Legal team so that they can explain to you where some of their definitional concerns come from, and also think about maybe some way forward with the recommendation that you're all trying to implement in a way that might be helpful to the intent of the recommendation without introducing a new term. They have concerns about the new term unaffiliated being introduced. That's the aspect. So I think it would be helpful to have that conversation with them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Larisa, when were we going to be told that Legal have concerns over work we've been well progressing over many months? I think that's kind of useful information for us to have earlier on even from Legal.

LARISA GURNICK: Agreed, Cheryl. We're doing our best to manage all the different workflows and information.

---

TOM BARRETT: All right. So do we schedule a meeting for Legal to join us after the next call to discuss this? Larisa, would you be organizing that, or how would we go about doing that?

LARISA GURNICK: Yeah. I anticipate that there will be a couple of action items, so this is one of them on our end is to set up a time to have this conversation with Legal. And there will be, I think, several others but I'll wait for you all to conclude your discussion, and then I'm happy to go through the action items that we've identified on our end.

TOM BARRETT: Fantastic. Thank you. So any other thoughts or comments from the working group? I turn it back to Larisa and get a feedback from ICANN Org.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Larisa, you want to take it away?

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much, Tom. Yes, sure. First, I just wanted to let you know that the OEC had a debrief similar to what you're all going through now. They had their meeting yesterday. They, overall, found the meeting really helpful. They appreciated the clarifications and the discussions

---

and wanted to sort of send the message, although I'm trying not to be a messenger back and forth, but send the message to continue having the interactions where it's helpful to clarify and help progress the work. So that's one item.

And then what they did do, also like yourselves, discuss the topics and the questions, including some takeaways. So we've taken notes on a couple of takeaways that would be helpful. Some of them are things that I think ICANN Org can help do. So starting with the Recommendation 10, which I know we keep calling rebalancing, perhaps the terminology is not quite accurate, but it's the recommendation that suggested that a rebalancing be done. And you came up with a proposal to do something to facilitate that rebalancing, ultimately.

So one of the takeaways for Org to do is—I think somebody mentioned—I apologize, I didn't capture who it was—that we would take a look at the various engagements with the community that you all have had and sort of summarize and quantify what kind of feedback you all received from the community, not just the GNSO but the broader community. So the Board would find that helpful. And perhaps as a point of clarification, the Independent Examiner suggested that the NomCom should be rebalanced but did not come up with a way for how that would be done. So in accepting that recommendation, I think there was a general understanding that there would be a proposal for eventual rebalancing, which is what the recommendation calls for. But given that that proposal would have pretty significant implications for the entirety of the ICANN community, the proposal itself or the means of rebalancing or whatever the proposal was would still have to have support of the community. So when there's points about level of

---

support from the community, it's not on not on any recommendation where you're implementing what the Independent Examiner and the Board had accepted. But in this case, in particular, because there was not a clarity of what the proposal would be when the recommendation was accepted, I think there is a sense that more engagement and support from the community would be important on your proposal for how to move forward. Let me pause here.

TOM BARRETT:

Larisa, I'll let Cheryl go first. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Thank you, Tom. The datasets you're talking about out of our interactions is exactly what I was referring to earlier, and that's going to be a very important piece of data to obviously give comfort on what we've done and how we've done it. Regarding what—I'm [lost] to call rebalancing so let's leave it as Rec 10. We talk to the community—not just the GNSO, the community—what we proposed as that way forward and we received no objections from most some concerns out of one SO and specifically the objections and concerns that we know of from part of the GNSO. So we're all aware of that. But that's not news. We've worked in that framing the whole time. We've reported on who's got concerns and who hasn't in all of our previous reports. So, none of this is new information. Clearly, it needs to be re-emphasized information or perhaps putting an executive summary that is actually read, I don't know. But it's not as if it's a new action item, it's what we've been doing.

---

If the suggestion from the OEC, however, is that we go back and continue on the implementation on the things that are not particularly critical out of any co-dependencies and interdependencies—I lost my words for a moment there—then that’s fine. But do we hold on Rec 10 and take it back to the community and say, “How would you like to do it?” Because that’s going to be another couple of years’ worth of work just on that recommendation. Of course, that’s assuming that whatever we do with a holistic review of ICANN doesn’t have superseding or more ordinant effects on all that.

You see where my concerns are about this particular amount of energy put into this particular amount of implementation work where what we thought we did and what we had reasonable community non-objection for was a simple clearing of the pathways. Now, if a simple clearing of the pathways is now suddenly inappropriate for the OEC, they just need to say it and we need to pull Rec 10 out. So we stop work on Rec 10, continue the rest of our work, wind up our work, and it becomes someone else’s problem.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl.

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, Cheryl. Sorry, Tom. Sorry.

TOM BARRETT: No, go ahead, Larisa. You go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK:

Sorry, I didn't mean to jump in front of you. I just wanted to respond to Cheryl in that there is no suggestion that something different should happen or what that ought to be. I think that the information that will be assembled to make it clear what kind of engagement has happened and kind of a nice summary of everything that had happened, because you clearly responded to the OEC that the group felt that you've done sufficient communication and engagement with the community and that you have the community support. So the takeaway on our end was that let's help document what that evidence looks like and we'll go from there. So I'm not suggesting that any more work ought to be done or needs to be done, other than to come up with that summary of information. I hope that makes sense.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Larisa. That's been helpful. So I asked Jean-Baptiste to display the implementation plan for Rec 10. So if you go all the way down to the last step, the Bylaw change is accepted and NomCom is rebalanced or Bylaw change is rejected and the status quo is maintained. These steps obviously don't reflect our most current approach to this recommendation. And in fact, the Bylaw change is not the last step but in fact somewhere in the middle if you take this recommendation at face value as a rebalancing recommendation. There's more to do even after the Bylaw change. Basically, it's the approach we're taking so far. So perhaps we need to reframe where we are on this recommendation. We've always been hoping that we're done after the Bylaw change, but in fact there is no rebalancing completed as a result of that. So either we

---

have to make the Bylaw change separate from Rec 10 and say Rec 10 is still in process or there's more to do after the Bylaw change. You've got some comments, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. Thanks. Clearly, my typing is no longer even looking like some semblance of the Australian language, let alone the English language. At least I don't type by the look of it. My apologies for what's in the chat. It looks like a code of some form.

Let's be really, really clear here. We recognize that a lot more needs to be done after the Bylaw change to bring about whatever outcome for the one part of the NomCom table where the non-commercial part of the GNSO houses are not balanced. That's what this is all about. It's what it was about at the beginning; it's what it's about at the end as well. However, there is clearly more work to do post Bylaws, but it's not our work. That's community work, that's GNSO work. So I don't think we do need to modify greatly our implementation plan. I think we in fact have pretty much, with some shuffling on what can become—I think we're up to seven. We are now looking at moving towards the Bylaw phase on this recommendation with all of the public and community interaction that a Bylaw change involves, with all of the opportunity for people's voices to be heard within that process. I think we need to make sure we keep what we need to do [sparkling star] very, very clear, and we don't need to do the post Bylaw change work that is then the AC and SO's job. Okay?

---

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, Cheryl. May I respond?

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead, Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: Okay. You're quite right that it's not clear whose job it will be to do the work that happens after, but also in terms of the steps that we're looking at here on the screen, I don't know. And I guess that's a question for you to what extent you think that the principles that should apply to determine the optimum NomCom composition based on the current ICANN community. It's item three. I don't know to what extent you feel that those principles have been defined into something that could be used for future rebalancing. Because that step, it's not clear what those principles would be that could be used in future rebalancing, for example.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah. Larisa, I think you're pointing out that there is a disconnect. Just one thought. There's only a disconnect between these words in our plan and if we did the implementation. I don't think we've done the job of going back and updating these steps to reflect our pros to implementing this recommendation. So, for example, a Bylaw change once accepted does not result in rebalance. So the last step is just [inaudible] and there may be some steps here that were starting to happen after the Bylaw change and we should reorganize these steps. Go ahead, Cheryl.



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. Thank you, Tom, and that's fine. But I could argue equally that three is in fact done. The principle we decided on is that the current seating at the NomCom table, having looked at all sorts of—and we looked at many—three finalists and only one managed to survive, including some very radical concepts we looked at possibilities, the principle we are looking at is a mapping that looks at AC and SO at the table and that we do not disenfranchise, for example, a particular Advisory Committee over another. Because, remember, we were being plead, called to, to just give the GAC seat to the GNSO. That was one of the solutions that was suggested to us. That would be a poor following of the principle of a mapping between what is the ICANN community and what sits at the current NomCom table for the NomCom in its current role and activity.

With the rebalancing, if we gave an equal number of seats to all the ACs and SOs, we had the counterpoint back from the community interactions we had with the ACs and SOs. For example, the SSAC, they can only just manage to get to some extent RSSAC the one person to get to spend the time to commit to the very onerous task as NomCom. So we could have said everybody gets an equal number but then we would have had those organizations, little parts of ICANN hard pushed to put people into the seats. So we looked at mapping, and so the mapping would be a principle if we need to articulate it, then I'm not sure why we need to do more than articulate it in a report, but we can change these plans to note, if needs be. But to change the plan, you do have to get the OEC's permission. We also need to make sure that in our reporting, we—this part I thought we had—make very clear that the clearing of the pathway of the principles so that now and until a future

---

rebalancing—and remember that was part of the recommendation as well, the every five years bit—review occurred, that there was no inhibition or inability for where the internal rebalancing of the seats allocated, that that was free and open to do and that’s where the Bylaw comes in. So I think we can probably articulate, Tom, far more effectively than I’ve just stumbled through then. A principle will be about 20 words long.

TOM BARRETT:

And I take Larisa’s comment in the chat to pull together various scenarios. I think responding [inaudible] number three here what principles should apply to the optimum NomCom composition. So we certainly did have that discussion. That’s not to say that if you put together some other SO/ACs, they would come up with the same answer to what we came up with. We certainly did consider that in terms of overall composition and decided to focus on the GNSO. I know some of the opposition has suggested that just looking at the GNSO perhaps is too narrow a way to assess the ICANN community and a lot of the groups within the GNSO would spill over into other groups, etc. That type of assessment can still take place. It doesn’t negate anything we’ve done and certainly we’re not the final word on the optimal NomCom composition but we did address that as part of our exercise.

I guess the only part I take issue with section eight where it says that Bylaw change is accepted and the NomCom is rebalanced. So that second part is not true. We’re not attempting to rebalance the NomCom with our implementation of this recommendation. So we just need to clarify step eight. I agree with Cheryl. I think we did all the other steps

---

certainly different than perhaps a process that would have been followed if there was a holistic assessment by the ATRT3 or a GNSO assessment. All those activities can still take place subsequent to our Bylaw change.

Any other discussion on this topic before Larisa moves to the next topic? Did you want to have any other final comment, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

Just that this has been really helpful. Just assembling this information and we're not asking you to do any additional work on this. I think this is something that we can easily compile from the work that's already been done and putting it all together into a kind of a context that would be helpful, is the right next step to bring clarity to this point and determine what needs to happen next. I'm sorry, Cheryl. I see your question but I don't follow your question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sorry. My apologies. Let me try and make it clear. I just wasn't sure that that was all of the next steps or actions going forward that you'd taken away from the debrief for the OEC. I just want to make sure because we got very excited about what it needed, very excited about two things, both of which are sort of Rec 10, but are there other things that we need to know about? That's all.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Cheryl. A few more things. Not many, though, because I think on the Standing Committee charter, which is the next item, if it would be

---

okay with you, I think that there might be some suggestions and potential ideas for making the charter more clear, if you would welcome that input that would come from the OEC. So that's another action item. And then we also took as an action item which really adds to an action item that was already there all along for you all to conclude your conversation with Göran in his capacity as the CEO because he'd like to address the recommendation on where NomCom support reports. I think he has some information to discuss with you on the budgeting process, how the budget for the NomCom works and the set within the broader context of the budgeting and planning process. And I know we ran out of time but he would like to circle back and conclude the conversation on the accountability or the transparency of the NomCom support staff kind of as a final issue. So that's another action item that we have.

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Larisa. I realized at the call that the word transparency and accountability are trigger words. We'll find a better word to describe [inaudible]. I would welcome that conversation. Any other thoughts?

LEAH SYMEKHER:

Sorry, Tom. Can you just repeat what you just said? You were totally muffled.

TOM BARRETT:

Yeah. What happened last week was I used the word—I tried to explain part of the purpose of some of the Standing Committee charter was to

---

improve the transparency and accountability of what ICANN Org does on behalf of NomCom. I think Göran got defensive and said, “We’re totally transparent. There’s nothing more transparent, for example, than what we do during the budget.” So it was a trigger word. I should find a better word like visibility or participation than using transparency. So that’s on me to articulate better what we’re trying to achieve here because I did sense he got defensive a bit when I brought that up. Again, next time we have that conversation, I’ll be better. Can you hear me okay?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yes, I did. And thank you for repeating that.

TOM BARRETT: Okay. I see Dave echoing that he took badly. So that’s on me. I’ll improve it next time terms of my word choice.

Any other takeaways from the meeting in terms of next steps from anybody? Anyone else in ICANN Org want to speak up? Okay. So I guess I say we move on to the next agenda topic.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yes, looks good.

---

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, guys. So, the next item had to do with changing the cadence of the meeting. This is a suggestion from ICANN Org. Who wants to weigh in and explain the reason behind this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do. Hang on.

TOM BARRETT: Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm all for moving it to every other week, don't get me wrong. Less meetings I have, the better. But can we just make sure there is a cycle of clashes, which I know only really, I suppose, affect me, but they should affect anyone involved in the GNSO at least. There are now once a month, at least, meetings at our same time on our same day which are the GNSO Council meetings. So if whatever cadence we set in, we now have an opportunity to avoid those standing calls that we know about that will affect other members of our working group. I think we should look closely at doing that and that's something that probably staff need to do, looking at the calendar, and really the calendar of all the ACs and the SOs.

TOM BARRETT: All right, Cheryl. Are you suggesting a Doodle poll, Cheryl? I guess we'll have to find out what other time will work for folks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: God, no. The last thing I want is another Doodle in my life, Tom. Let me be really clear. I'm fine for every other week. It's when that every other week starts. And we have an opportunity to avoid having a meeting and an every other week cadence that clashes with at least one major meeting that I know of and that is the GNSO Council meeting, which used to rotate in time but for this year is now 19:00 UTC on the same day or at least once a month. So if we are going to move, then let's make sure we move to avoid clashes so that the off week of our meeting is when that regularized and publicized in the calendar event is, and I suspect there might be others. That's all. God, no. Don't send me a Doodle. I don't want one.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Thanks, Cheryl. Any other comments on this proposal? So I'm not hearing any objections. I assume this is a suggestion from ICANN Org based on their perhaps conflicts with their schedule as well.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Tom, I listened to what Cheryl just said and I'll look into that. What I wanted to add on the suggestion is that we are looking at ways to support the work more effectively. This was our suggestion to schedule that every two weeks so that we can better plan on the different requests and preparation related to that. And also we saw that, for example, leadership coordination calls may be [inaudible] week to look at the agenda and for the status on some of the requests that would be

---

also feasible. I heard that [should be up to] two with the proposal. So we'll look into that mindful of what Cheryl just shared. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Yeah. So that's fine with me. In terms of next steps. [Inaudible] Legal on some of our Bylaw change.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, Tom—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're breaking up again, Tom. Sorry. You're breaking up again. Can you say that again? He went underwater again.

TOM BARRETT: Sorry. Is this better?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely.

TOM BARRETT: All right. I'll switch to my laptop. So what I'd like to suggest is I'd like to know if there's other feedback from either Legal or ICANN Org how we're approaching changing the NomCom Operating Procedures, what kind of review that needs to go through versus having a Standing Committee Operating Procedures. Is there any feedback or disagreement with the approach we're taking there?



LEAH SYMEKHER: Tom, may I suggest that we come back to that after we've given you the feedback on the Standing Committee charter? I think that might be clearer, but I'll take it, we'll make a note of it that you're looking for some feedback on the approach to the operating procedures as well. So we'll take that on.

TOM BARRETT: All right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Tom. Larisa, Cheryl here. I'm pretty sure I understood you correctly that the OEC had some particular suggestions that they were hoping we'd like to hear—and I, for one, would definitely like to hear them—regarding the charter. So maybe regardless of when, which should be as soon as possible, we organize something with ICANN Legal, and that's kind of on several things, surely talking to Legal about the charter before we've looked at what we can incorporate from the OEC suggestions is a waste of resources. So we should perhaps do the OEC suggestions into the charter and then have Legal look at that. But we seem to need to have a talk to Legal regarding their specific concerns that they failed to manage to give to us to date regarding introducing a new term in their sacrosanct area of Independent Examiner. So that's a sort of separate issue. So I'm thinking we might want to split those out, Tom, and certainly wanting a slower order than the other.

---

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, Cheryl. Next agenda item, semi-annual update to the OEC. Again, you've heard me say it before. My goal here was to get an updated draft of the Operating Procedures, both of the NomCom and the Standing Committee. That has been my primary goal. Does anyone else want to suggest other goals for the mid-year report?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, I don't see that we have the time to do other than just that if we can as best we can.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, it sounds like they may send Jean feedback from Legal and OEC on what they want to do. As Larisa said in the chat, we need to come back on timing, I guess from feedback. Jean-Baptiste, did you want to address anything else in this agenda item?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, no. I just wanted to raise what was in the chat. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Should we go to the next agenda item?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Tom. So the next one is about Any Other Business, and then what you have on the screen is regarding the next meeting and following the first discussion, then we'll have a look at when would be the next meeting and we will confirm that to you as soon as possible.

TOM BARRETT: All right. So it's either next week or in two weeks. So you'll get back to us?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Correct.

TOM BARRETT: All right. Any other business from anybody?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No.

TOM BARRETT: Thanks, everybody. Have a great day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Bye.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Bye, everybody. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you all. Bye-bye.

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**